

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XIX

OCTOBER, 1948

No. 10

The Inaugural Vision of Ezekiel

By WALTER R. ROEHRS

"Ezekiel is the strangest figure in the goodly fellowship of the prophets . . . probably no book of the Old Testament is as little read as his, and it may well be the least popular, as it is the least known of the Old Testament."¹ This is the verdict on the Book of Ezekiel in the most recent book on the Prophets of the Old Testament. It may comfort the modern Bible student to know that it has troubled the exegetes, Jewish and Christian, through the centuries. Luther² quotes Jerome as saying that the early rabbis considered its contents so profound and vexing that they decreed that no one should study the beginning and the end of the book before he had reached the age of thirty. Jerome³ himself considered it the most difficult of the Holy Scriptures and spoke of it as an "ocean of divine mysteries." He needed the encouragement of his friend Eustochius to undertake the interpretation of the "labyrinth" which he found especially in the second part, chaps. 40—48.

Shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, 70 A. D., an effort was made by the School of Shammai to have the Book of Ezekiel withdrawn from public reading because it appeared to be in conflict with the Pentateuch. It took the resourcefulness of Rabbi Chananyah ben Hezekiah

¹ Paterson, John, *The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets*, "Studies, Historical, Religious, and Expository in the Hebrew Prophets," 1948, p. 160.

² St. Louis, XIV: 45.

³ Compare his *Commentary on Ezekiel* at the end of Ezek. 39; 40: 13; and 45: 10.

to harmonize these contradictions, and as a result the Council of Jamnia did not alter its status.⁴ Dr. Fuerbringer says, "Hence his descriptions are often mysterious, dark and enigmatical, difficult to understand."⁵

Anyone who has at all looked into the book knows what makes it difficult. "It abounds in allegories and apocalyptic imagery, and it operates with grotesque forms and bizarre ideas. Its complicated figures and its 'wheels within wheels' (1:16) have offered ample scope for the ingenuity of Christian and Jewish commentators and for others less qualified who find delight in regarding the Bible as a book of conundrums or a volume of riddles."⁶

The inaugural vision, which we have chosen as our topic, is in the thick of these difficulties. It was one of the sections that prompted the rabbis to say to the inexperienced regarding the Book of Ezekiel, "Tarry at Jericho till your beard be grown," 2 Sam. 10:5. It is not brash foolhardiness, however, which prompted this attempt at an interpretation of so difficult a section of the Old Testament. Because the opening vision is so essential for the message and the understanding of the whole book, this modest contribution is made toward an appreciation of the vital message of this Old Testament book — a message that is so pertinent for the Church and the world of today.

The historical background of the book can be presented merely parenthetically here. When Nebuchadnezzar brought Ezekiel to Babylonia with King Jehoiachin and others of the upper strata of society in 597 (2 Kings 25:10-16), Daniel had been there almost ten years (Dan. 1:1). Five years later, on the fifth day of the fourth month, the heavens were opened, and Ezekiel, the priest, was called to the prophetic office (Ezek. 1:2). Perhaps he was thirty years old at the time.⁷ When

⁴ Steinmueller, John E., *A Companion to Scripture Studies*, II, p. 265 f. Tradition says that 300 jars of oil were consumed in the effort — "midnight oil!"

⁵ Fuerbringer, L., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 73.

⁶ Paterson, *op. cit.*, p. 169

⁷ Ezek. 1:1: "Now it came to pass in the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, in the fifth day of the month, as I was among the captives by the river of Chebar, that the heavens were opened, and I saw visions of God." Much effort and ingenuity has gone into the interpretation of this "thirtieth year." To make it apply to the age of the Prophet is a very attractive suggestion. Thus already Jerome, alluding to the age of Jesus in Luke 3:23. It was at the age of thirty that a young priest

Jerusalem fell six years later, his prophecy of doom, as well as that of Jeremiah, his contemporary, was vindicated. His discourses are supplied with more specific dates than any of the other prophetic books.⁸ The thirteenth and last discourse was spoken fifteen years after the destruction of the city—in the year 571 (Ezek. 29:17).⁹ We lose the trail of Ezekiel in the tradition that he was murdered by leaders of the people whom he had reprimanded for idolatry.¹⁰

Ezekiel is often spoken of as "an hard man." Hosea's and Jeremiah's human heart of emotion comes to the surface in their messages. Ezekiel's feelings are buried in the stern demands of his duty.¹¹ When his wife, "the desire of thine eyes," is taken from him in death, he is told: "Yet neither shalt thou mourn nor weep, neither shall thy tears run down," Ch. 24:16. His eyes remained dry also when the news of the

began his ministrations in the Temple. Linguistic difficulties arise in the phraseology used here. The age of a person is expressed consistently by the Hebrew phrase: "He was the son of 30 years." Others have tried to find an era of time in this note. But no agreement can be reached on the *terminus a quo*. The reform under Josiah in 621 B.C. (2 Kings 22) has been suggested as marking the beginning of this new era. Others want to begin counting from the beginning of the Chaldean period, such as the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's reign in 625 B.C. Jewish interpreters (e.g., Kimhi) think it was the thirtieth year of the current jubilee year. If it refers to some era, it would be an otherwise unused basis of computation in the Old Testament. Other commentators solve the problem by resorting to emendations and theories of later annotators of the text.

⁸ Besides the date of his call, thirteen other specific references to time are given: 3:16; 8:1; 20:1; 24:1; 26:1; 29:1; 29:17; 30:20; 31:1; 32:1; 32:17; 33:21; 40:1. Almost without exception the month and the day are specified besides the year. The years are computed from the beginning of the captivity of Jehoiachin as in ch. 1:2.

⁹ Since the latest date occurs in ch. 29 and references to earlier times follow in succeeding chapters, it is clear that the book is not arranged entirely on a chronological basis. The topical sequence breaks in as in the section dealing with foreign nations (Chs. 26-32).

¹⁰ Other legends have grown around the person of Ezekiel. He is supposed to have been the teacher of Pythagoras or also the servant of Jeremiah. He is said to have been buried in the tomb of Shem and Arphaxad.

¹¹ Many writers regard Ezekiel as subject to cataleptic seizures because they believe to find abnormal elements in his personality. This view of Ezekiel began with the publication of Klostermann's essay in *Studien und Kritiken* in 1877. The most recent, thoroughgoing, and revolting treatment of this subject is an article by E. C. Broome, Jr., in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1946, Vol. 65, pp. 277-292. According to the author, Ezekiel was the victim of paranoid schizophrenia. Using modern psychological terminology, he arrives at results such as this: When Ezekiel receives a vision involving a sharp knife (ch. 5), he has hallucinations of castration!

fall of Jerusalem came. His rebuke of sin, and his threat of punishment, is almost unbrokenly stern. Luther says: "Hezekiel weissagt viel haerter und mehr als Jeremias wie Jerusalem sollte zerstoert werden und das Volk mit Koenig und Fuersten umkommen."¹² But under this hard devotion to his task we find a love for his people as strong as that of any other Prophet (cf. ch. 16 and his pleading for his people, ch. 11: 13 ff.). He fairly revels in the portrayal of the good things that he is permitted to present after the fall of Jerusalem.

The Book of Ezekiel escaped the first onslaughts of the Wellhausen school of higher criticism. It is only about forty years ago that some scholars began in all seriousness to take the book apart. With varying degrees of negations and contradictory theories, the unity, authenticity, and Babylonian origin have been called into question.¹³ However, McFayden's statement is still true: "We have in Ezekial the rare satisfaction of studying a carefully elaborated prophecy whose authenticity, until recently, has been practically undisputed. . . . the order and precision of the priestly mind are reflected in the unusually systematic arrangement of the book."¹⁴ The Masoretic text suggests some difficulties so that even Moeller says: "Der masoretische Text ist oft recht dunkel und schwie-

¹² St. Louis XIV: 44f.

¹³ The critical dismemberment of the book began with the publication of Hoelscher's book *Hezekiel, der Dichter und das Buch*, in 1924. Only 170 of the 1,273 verses in the first 39 chapters were permitted to stand as genuine. Millar Burrows in *The Literary Relations of Ezekiel*, 1925, moves the Prophet into the pre-Maccabean age. C. C. Torrey in *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy*, 1930, repeats Ezekiel's experience of ch. 8 and transports him to Jerusalem as the scene of his activity, but now it is the year 230 B. C. J. Smith in *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, 1931, makes Ezekiel active among the captives of the Northern Kingdom and later in Jerusalem. Hertrich in "Ezekielstudien," ZAW 61, 1932, finds that Ezekiel was active only in Jerusalem and attributes the Babylonian background of the book to a later redactor. The latest publication of this nature is by Dr. William A. Irwin of the University of Chicago, *The Problem of Ezekiel*, 1943. He finds merely 251 authentic verses in the first thirty-nine chapters and rejects chs. 40-48 *in toto*.

¹⁴ McFadyen, John Edgar, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1932, p. 187. Other champions of the unity of the book are: Kuhl, Curt, *Die literarische Einheit des Buches Ezechiel*, 1917. Kessler, Werner, *Die Innere Einheitlichkeit des Buches Ezechiel*, 1926. Haag, D. Dr. Herbert, *Was Lehrt die literarische Untersuchung des Ezechiel-Textes*, 1943. Moeller, Wilhelm, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1934. For a criticism of Dr. Irwin's method see *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. VII, 1945, p. 438ff.

rig; jedoch hilft in solchen Faellen auch die LXX nicht weiter." ¹⁵

The fall of the holy city, ch. 33, divides the twenty-two years of the Prophet's activity. Before that event Ezekiel is, in the main, a stern preacher of repentance; after it he becomes the messenger of hope and comfort.

The exiles in Babylon, as well as the people at home, remained a "rebellious house." The deported considered the visitation of God an injustice. Ezek. 18:2: "What mean ye that ye use this proverb concerning the Land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge?" They also shared with the folks at home the false notion that the Temple was inviolate. Jeremiah had as little success in opposing this misconception (Jer. 7) as Ezekiel. Hence the false hope was perpetuated that the exile would soon terminate (Jer. 29). Ezekiel shatters this false hope because of the abominations which he sees in full bloom in Jerusalem (chs. 8-11) and because of the idolatry which was practiced at Babylonia in spite of the punishment that had already come upon them (chs. 14, 20). "They shall yet know that I am the Lord, your God" ¹⁶ — God cannot but let punishment follow upon sin as effect follows the cause.

But God is also faithful in His promises.¹⁷ Already before the fall of the city some rays of light entered the dark picture. Once the people have taken away "all the detestable things thereof and all the abominations thereof from thence" (Ezek. 11:18), "I will gather you from the people and as-

¹⁵ Moeller, *op cit.*, p. 116.

¹⁶ This phrase occurs no less than 63 times in the book. It occurred previously, in Ex. 6:7, when God made a Covenant with His people through Moses. This relationship between Israel and God is reflected in this frequent refrain. As Israel's Covenant God, He cannot tolerate idolatry — a breach of that Covenant, Ezek. 6:7, 13, 14; 7:4, 9, 27; 14:7-8; 23:49. As a result, the impending punishment will be severe: His people will go into exile, Ezek. 12:15, 20; 13:14; 22:16; His Temple and His city will be destroyed, Ezek. 24:21, 27. Even the heathen are to see that God avenges unfaithfulness, Ezek. 12:16.

¹⁷ These promises are again tied to the phrase and the Covenant concept: they shall know that I am the Lord, your God. There will be a new Covenant, Ezek. 16:62. God will lead His people out of the land of captivity, as he once brought Israel out of Egypt, Ezek. 20:42, 44; 34:27; 36:11, etc. The heathen nations will be punished and will recognize Him as the true God, Ezek. 25:5, 7; 26:6; 28:22-24; 38:23; etc., who is able to put His program of deliverance into effect. The Covenant concept as the basis for the message of Ezekiel is discussed in the book by Haag, *op. cit.*

semble you out of the countries where you have been scattered, and I will give you the Land of Israel" (Ezek. 11:17), "and I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh and will give them an heart of flesh" (Ezek. 11:19). The news of the fall of Jerusalem had a devastating effect on the exiles. Some even believed that the claim of the Babylonians of Marduk's superiority over Jehovah was proved and turned their back completely on the true God. Even the faithful remnant was inclined to despair because they felt themselves rejected of God. They said: "If our transgressions and our sins be upon us and we pine away in them, how should we then live?" Ezek. 33:10. How could all the glorious prophecies of God be fulfilled when the Temple and the people to whom all the promises were tied had ceased to be? What a happy privilege it was for Ezekiel, then, to be able to paint the picture of the enduring Kingdom of the Messiah. All enemies go down in defeat before it (chs. 25—32); a new Covenant will be established in spite of Gog and Magog (chs. 33—39); God will dwell in the Temple of His people and receive their sacrificial devotion (chs. 40—48).

Hence we can sum up the message of Ezekiel: God is faithful — He executes His threats and He keeps His promises. *Soli deo gloria!*¹⁸

What relation, then, does the vision have to this message?

It is central to the whole thought content of the book. In the awesome majesty of this vision, Ezekiel is called to his difficult task — "As I was among the captives by the river Chebar," ch. 1:1. Ezekiel could never forget that solemn event, and yet that same vision appears to him three times more in order to sustain the Prophet in his arduous task, to fortify him against any doubt of the fulfillment of God's Word, — the judgment would come although popular opinion scoffed at it, and the promise would be realized although outward appearances seemed to say that God's people had ceased to exist and could have no future. The repetition of the vision came to him at the strategic moments of his ministry, in the pivotal pronouncements of his message.

¹⁸ "So wird Gott voellig zu dem, was ihm gebuehrt zu sein: nicht nur Mittel fuer das hoechste Beduerfnis der Menschen, sondern hoechster Zweck ueber allen Zwecken." Niebergall, Friedrich, *Praktische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, Vol. 2, p. 241.

The first reappearance of it comes soon after his call. In the third chapter we are told that the hand of the Lord was upon him and directed him to prophesy the main burden of his message: the destruction of the city in allegorical portrayal. Ezek. 3:23: "Then I arose and went forth into the plain, and, behold, the glory of the Lord stood there, as the glory *which I saw by the river of Chebar*. And I fell on my face."

He sees this same vision again when the doom of the city is sealed and its actual downfall begins in the visible departure of the Lord from the Temple and the city. In chs. 8—11 he had been brought by the Spirit to the Holy City to see the abominations of his people. "And, behold, the glory of the God of Israel was there, *according to the vision that I saw in the plain*," ch. 8:4. "Then the glory of the Lord departed from off the threshold of the house," ch. 10:18. "And the glory of the Lord went up from the midst of the city," ch. 11:23. When God leaves, destruction has begun.

When the "constructive" part of his ministry begins, the vision comes a third time. In ch. 43 the Lord takes up His habitation again in the new Temple as a pledge of His abiding presence among His people and in His Church. Things looked bad for the future of God's plans. But "the glory of the Lord came into the house," ch. 43:4. "And the visions were like the vision *that I saw by the river Chebar*," ch. 43:3.

If this opening vision is the motif of the whole book and the undergirding of its whole message, an effort to catch some of its meaning will be necessary. Before we take up its various aspects, we may state that its significance runs out in one main thought: the transcendent majesty and power of God. His will will be done: the sinner cannot escape; the faithful can trust in Him. When we examine the vision more in detail, we find each phase adding a stroke of color to this picture.

God has appeared in visions to other men. Moses saw God in the burning bush, Ex. 3:2 ff. From a "still small voice" God spoke to Elijah, 1 Kings 19:12-13. Micaiah told wicked King Ahab: "I saw the Lord sitting on His throne, and all the host of heaven standing by Him on His right hand and on His left," 1 Kings 22:19. Isaiah was overcome when he saw "the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and His train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims," Is. 6:1-2.

But no other vision is described in such detail. Can this complete picture be accounted for merely by Ezekiel's style? In reading his book one cannot but be struck by the painstaking attention to detail with which he paints his word pictures. His description of the new Temple is the most obvious example. In his discourses, too, he strains himself to be sure that no feature is overlooked or forgotten. To our feelings of rhetoric he almost becomes tiring in his repetitiousness. He goes back and forth over the same territory to be sure that the reader follows and has not lost precious minutiae. No doubt the particular form of the description of the vision is in keeping with his characteristic genre. But there can be just as little doubt that each daub of paint on this celestial canvas has a purpose and meaning.

It must be clear from the outset that most of the features of this vision go back to previous media of God's revelation to His chosen people: the cherubim, the throne, the storm, the fire, the rainbow, etc. As we look at each of these, it also is apparent that in some instances there are either new details or in some instances rather pronounced differences from the previous manifestations of God's glory. The question will arise whether this fuller picture or its different features are added here because of the situation in which the revelation comes.

There was, in the first place, a reason why God employed the old symbols of His presence. We must remember that God is appearing in Babylonia and that the vision is meant for the people as such, in exile and in Jerusalem, as well as for the Prophet. To Ezekiel and the exiled Jews this meant much. It reassured them that God could appear in an "unclean" land. His sovereignty was not restricted to the Temple and the Holy Land. To the faithful who were faced with the prospect of the destruction of God's ordained habitation in their midst this was "to give a concrete pledge that through the imminent visitation of doom upon the sinful people and kingdom the essence of God's kingdom would not be obliterated, but that the Lord God would continue to reveal Himself as the living God and preserve His kingdom and in His own time would bring about its full glorification."¹⁹ The same God

¹⁹ Keil, Friedrich, und Delitzsch, Franz, *Biblischer Commentar ueber das Alte Testament*, Vol. III, 1868, p. 28.

whose glory inhabited the Holy of Holies in the Temple was there in Babylonia, in their midst. Let the faithful take comfort. And if there were henotheistic aberrations in the minds of some, this vision was to reaffirm the true concept of God's universal sovereignty.

But another environment factor must be borne in mind. The Jews were in Babylonia. Here they were exposed to hearing the praises of Marduk and the other gods. Did not Marduk give victory to the Babylonians over the Jews? Did he not thereby prove his superiority over Jehovah? We are told expressly that Nebuchadnezzar did much to glorify the Babylonian gods.²⁰ He spent much to rebuild the temples and to equip them with the images and other sacred paraphernalia. The processions in honor of the gods were held with every possible pomp and circumstance. If any among the Jews was tempted to idolatry or at least to some syncretistic compromise, here was the warning: Jehovah is exalted above these idols. If some of the Babylonian symbols and representations of their gods seem to resemble those of the true God, they are meaningless and vain because God sits enthroned over them. The detailed features of Ezekiel's vision and the new elements in it seem to have their purpose also in this background.²¹

If we keep these two background factors in mind, the vision will have a fuller meaning as we examine its various aspects.

I

Ezekiel sees the vision approaching from the north, ch. 1:4. He and his hearers were familiar with this origin of God's coming to judgment. Jeremiah had proclaimed: Jer. 4:6: "Set up the standard toward Zion: retire, stay not; for I will bring evil from the north and a great destruction"; and Jer. 1:14: "Then the Lord said unto me, Out of the north an evil shall break forth upon all the inhabitants of the land." Let the heathen prate about the North as the primordial home of the gods, Jehovah is the One who controls world events.

²⁰ Cf. the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar in *Die Neubabylonischen Koenigsinschriften* by Stephen Langdon.

²¹ Cf. Heinisch, Paul, *die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments, Das Buch Ezechiel*, 1923, pp. 27-32. Duerr, Lorenz, *Ezechiel's Vision von der Erscheinung Gottes im Lichte der Vorderasiatischen Altertumskunde*, 1917.

II

Jehovah comes "in a whirlwind" and in a "great cloud." Thus He had come before to reveal His purpose to Elijah (1 Kings 19:11): "And He said: Go forth, and stand upon the mount before the Lord. And, behold, the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains and brake in pieces the rocks before the Lord; but the Lord was not in the wind; and after the wind an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake." Again, Nah. 1:3: "The Lord is slow to anger and great in power and will not at all acquit the wicked. The Lord hath His way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of His feet."²² God rules supreme over the forces of nature. Don't let the Babylonians tell you that Marduk is "the lord of the storm." Don't believe the account in Enuma Elish which portrays him as defeating Tiamat with "the flood storm, a great weapon."²³

III

"And a fire infolding itself," Ch. 1:4. Ezekiel and his hearers would recall Deut. 4:24: "For the Lord, thy God, is a consuming fire, even a jealous God." Isaiah had said, ch. 10:17: "And the Light of Israel shall be for a fire and his Holy One for a flame; and it shall burn and devour his thorns and his briars in one day." Fire is the symbol of the destroying power of God. This meaning was further made clear in a later vision, Ezek. 10:2: "And he spake unto the man clothed with linen and said: Go in between the wheels, even under the cherub, and fill thine hand with coals of fire from between the cherubims and scatter them over the city. And he went in my sight."²⁴ Did Marduk and the Babylonians destroy Jerusalem and the Temple? No, this consuming fire emanates from Jehovah.

²² Cf. also Ex. 19:18; 1 Kings 19:11; Job 37:1 ff.; 38:1; 40:2; Is. 30:27; Hab. 3; Ps. 18:10 ff.; 50:3; 68:8-9.

²³ Heidel, Alexander, *The Babylonian Genesis*, 1942, Tablet IV, lines 45-49, p. 28:

He created *imhullu*: the evil wind, the whirlwind, the hurricane,
The fourfold wind, the sevenfold wind, the cyclone, the wind
incomparable.

He sent forth the winds which he created, the seven of them;
To trouble Tiamat within, they arose behind him.
The lord raised up the flood storm, his mighty weapon.

²⁴ Cf. also Gen. 15:17; Ex. 3:2; 19:18; Is. 4:5; 30:27; 66:15.

IV

"And a brightness was about it and out of the midst thereof as the color of amber, out of the midst of the fire," Ezek. 1:4. Light is a symbol of God's essence. Israel followed the pillar of light through the wilderness. Ps. 104:1-2: "Bless the Lord, O my soul. O Lord, my God, Thou art very great. Thou art clothed with honor and majesty, who coverest Thyself with light as with a garment, who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain." The New Testament even says: "God is Light" (1 John 1:5). Remember, O Israel, Jehovah is Light. Shamash, the sun god, is darkness.

V

God appears to Ezekiel on a throne. Ezek. 1:26; "And above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone: and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it." Isaiah had seen the throne of God. Is. 6:1: "In the year that King Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and His train filled the temple." Micaiah saw the Lord upon a throne in the presence of the kings of Israel and of Judah (1 Kings 22:10). Jehovah is higher than the combined kingdoms of Ahab and Jehoshaphat. He is higher than the throne of Nebuchadnezzar and Marduk.²⁵ Nothing is over Him; everything is under Him.

VI

One of the best-known parts of the vision is the conveyance upon which the throne of God rests and by which it, together with the cherubim, moves in all directions. It had a wheel at each corner. Each wheel in turn was constructed so that "it was, as it were, a wheel in the middle of the wheel." Just how these wheels were connected with the cherubim and the throne is not stated. As a celestial chariot it is not bound to the ordinary laws of locomotion. The one thing that they clearly signify is that Jehovah's will moves into execution;

²⁵ No doubt the Israelites heard the hymns extolling the Babylonian Gods. "There is no god like Marduk' is the burden of the many hymns," Jastrow, Morris, *The Civilization of the Babylonians and Assyrians*, p. 207. Thus in a text found at Sippar these lines occur:

Mighty lord of lords, strong Marduk —

Lord of lords, king of heaven and earth, granting prosperity.

His commands are carried out everywhere, instantly, without the loss of time, Ezek. 1:17. The Jews in Babylonia and at home were familiar with God's chariot of fire. 2 Kings 2:11: "And it came to pass, as they still went on and talked, that, behold, there appeared a chariot of fire and horses of fire and parted them both asunder, and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven." Hab. 3:8: "Was the Lord displeased against the rivers? Was Thine anger against the rivers? Was Thy wrath against the sea, that Thou didst ride upon Thine horses and Thy chariots of salvation?"²⁶ Marduk and the gods of Babylonia also rode in chariots. In colorful processions the exiles saw how they were moved about the streets and made the object of veneration. This custom had its roots in their mythology. When Marduk subdued Tiamat, he mounted his chariot. The sun god, Shamash, has a chariot and a driver, Bunene.²⁷ O Israel, forget not Jehovah's chariot of old; see, in the land of Marduk, it is Jehovah's chariot that stands ready to carry forth His decrees.

VII

In the interpretation of the vision the prominence given to the number *four* dare not be overlooked. There are four cherubim with four faces and four wings; there are four wheels, "when they went, they went upon their four sides"; the whole makes up a square of four sides. This can only refer to God's sovereignty over the whole world. The term "four corners of the earth" denotes the universality of God's providence. Ezekiel in a later chapter (7:2) applies the term "four corners" to the Land of Israel when he wants to emphasize its complete destruction. It is used in the same sense by Isaiah (11:12): "And He shall set up an ensign for the nations and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth."

²⁶ A chariot is also a part of Daniel's vision, Dan. 7:9: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of His head like the pure wool. His throne was like the fiery flame and His wheels as burning fire." Cf. also Deut. 33:26; Ps. 67:17; Is. 66:15.

²⁷ In *Enuma Elish*: He mounted the chariot, the storm incomparable (and) terrible; Heidel, *op. cit.*, Tablet IV, line 50, p. 28. Special wagons and chariots were maintained in the Babylonian and Assyrian temples. On New Year's Day the statue of Marduk was driven about the city in solemn procession. The kings delighted in furnishing these ornate conveyances for the temples. Duerr, *op. cit.*, p. 13 ff.

The Book of Revelation speaks of "four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth," Rev. 7:1. Nebuchadnezzar may claim to be the ruler over the "four quarters of the earth." This is but an empty boast; Jehovah holds them in His hand.

The many eyes which are found in the wheels can only denote a similar thought: God is aware of all things, and nothing will escape His eye.

VIII

The most prominent feature of the vision is the group of cherubim. These ministering spirits of God were well known to every Israelite. He found them in almost every book of the Old Testament, and every priest could tell of their use in the symbolism of the Temple. They appear in the beginning of man's history as the divine guardians of the Garden of Eden after Adam and Eve had been expelled from its bliss (Gen. 3:24). From the Book of Exodus everyone knew that God had commanded Moses Ex. 25:18: "And thou shalt make two cherubims of gold, of beaten work shalt thou make them, in the two ends of the mercy seat"; and Ex. 26:31: "And thou shalt make a veil of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen of cunning work: with cherubims shall it be made." In the Temple, "within the oracle, he [Solomon] made two cherubims of olive tree, each ten cubits high," 1 Kings 6:23. 1 Kings 6:27-29: "And he set the cherubims within the inner house; and they stretched forth the wings of the cherubims, so that the wing of the one touched the one wall and the wing of the other cherub touched the other wall and their wings touched one another in the midst of the house. And he overlaid the cherubims with gold. And he carved all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of cherubims and palm trees and open flowers, within and without." "And he made ten bases of brass . . . and on the borders that were between the ledges were . . . cherubims," 1 Kings 7:27, 29. "Between the cherubim" is the dwelling place of God (Is. 37:16; Ps. 80:1; 99:1; 1 Sam. 4:4; 2 Sam. 6:2). When God came to manifest Himself, "He rode upon a cherub and did fly; yea, He did fly upon the wings of the wind," Ps. 18:10.

However, two aspects of the cherubim in Ezekiel's vision must be noted. In the first place, they are described more

fully here than in the other accounts. The only feature mentioned by the other writers is their equipment of wings. In the second place, even a casual reading cannot fail to note that these four cherubim differ in several important respects from the brief description of the others. The cherubim in the Temple and Tabernacle appear to have at most two faces, that of a man and that of a lion, but Ezekiel sees four faces on each cherub; the former had two wings each, and these are equipped with four wings. Even the cherubim of Ezekiel's own Temple have but two faces (Ezek. 41:18).

Have these heavenly denizens always appeared in the form in which Ezekiel describes them, and is the difference merely this, that Ezekiel gives us a fuller description of them? This is possible. However, if they are spirits, they may at God's command become manifest in various shapes and forms. It is also quite likely that the very minute description of these celestial beings in Ezekiel has a purpose, which can be found in the place and time of this vision.

The place and time again are Babylonia and the exile. In this heathen environment the Jews saw many fantastic pictorial reproductions of their gods, and they heard them described as creatures of composite nature in their literature. Genii with horned caps (indicating divine rank), human in form but supplied with wings, guard the tree of life. As the Jews passed the temples and palaces, they could not help seeing the many sculptured winged lions and bulls with human heads guarding the entrances of these buildings. Or they saw them in relief work on the walls of the towers and passages. Thus the processional street in Babylon was flanked by a guard of sixty such lion colossi. These composite creatures are also depicted as upholding the divine throne or as directly bearing up the god. In the hymns sung in honor of the gods many animals are included in the imagery. The ox is the metaphor of robust vitality and power, hence the gods are called "strong ox" or "great ox," and Adad, simply the "celestial ox." Shamash, Ishtar, and especially Enlil are called "lions," the king of the animal world. The sun god is represented by the eagle, the king of birds. On the cylinder seals some deities are depicted with more than one head. Even the name "kuribu" is found. Esarhaddon reports that he erected a "kuribu deity" in the sanctuary of the temple of Ashur.

The people of whom Ezekiel told this vision could very well understand it. Like the other aspects of it, the cherubim emphasized God's majesty and power as unchallenged and supreme over everything. The cherubim have a human head. Man is supreme on earth by reason of his intelligence, but he is God's creature made in His image. The second face is that of an ox, the strongest among the domesticated animals. A human king is compared to an ox in 1 Kings 22:11 because he will "push the Syrians until thou have consumed them." And Jehovah Himself is called the Strong One (*abir*), a word of the same consonantal structure as the word for ox. The lion, the third face, as king of the beasts, was well known as a metaphor of terror and as inspiring awe. In the blessing of Jacob we read, Gen. 49:9: "Judah is a lion's whelp. From the prey, my son, thou art gone up: he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion; who shall rouse him up?" God's threat of judgment is said to be the roaring of a lion in Amos 1:2: "And he said, The Lord will roar from Zion and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the habitations of the shepherds shall mourn, and the top of Carmel shall wither." The eagle, the fourth face, is king of the winged creatures; his flight is high and fast. Deut. 28:49: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand." Hos. 8:1: "Set the trumpet to thy mouth. He shall come as an eagle against the house of the Lord, because they have transgressed My Covenant and trespassed against My Law." Jer. 4:13: "Behold, he shall come up as clouds, and his chariots shall be as a whirlwind: his horses are swifter than eagles. Woe unto us! for we are spoiled." Ezekiel, in ch. 17, compared the kings of Babylon and Egypt to an eagle. These four-faced celestial beings are equipped with wings to execute God's decrees with dispatch. They have hands in order to work in His service. The "fourness" of the features again makes for the picture of completeness.

Have you Israelites seen the mythological creatures and demons in Babylonia? Are they exalted as lords of the universe? Is victory over you ascribed to their operations? Don't be misled. God's ministering spirits have their combined attributes of power, and they are His servants standing

at attention, as it were, ready to do His bidding, at His beck and call. Jehovah is God. He is; all other gods are not. He rules also in this foreign and hostile territory. His purposes are always and everywhere carried out.

IX

The description of the vision ends with these words: "As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of One that spake," Ezek. 1:28. God's power and majesty as it appears in this vision is not merely bent on destruction. The rainbow is also in the picture. Just as the Deluge had to come as a result of man's rebellion, so "this rebellious house" will also go down in disaster. But in the skies of the destinies of God's kingdom there shines the symbol of His promise of enduring grace. "Behold, I establish My covenant with you and your seed after you," Gen. 9:9.

With the meaning of the main features of this formidable vision in mind, we recall again that it comes to Ezekiel not only at the time of his call, but that it is repeated at the crucial turning points of his ministry as indicated above. In fact, every word of Ezekiel proceeds from its focus as the spoke of a wheel from its axis. It sustained the Prophet when he pronounced doom upon the Temple, the city, and the nation; it sustained his faith when he predicted the everlasting temple and people of God's Kingdom of Grace. It should have meant all this to everyone who heard the Prophet or who read his message.

And it should mean this also to us. We can visualize the shape of the vision if God should choose to appear today as He did to Ezekiel. He might appear in the fire of His righteousness over the trappings of the church that has the form of godliness but not its power. He might appear in the rumblings of thunder over a Protestantism which says, "The temple, the temple," but has filled it with the abominations of its own making. He might appear in a storm cloud over a nation that worships the dollar sign and idolizes the power that is in things. He might appear in the avenging brightness of His truth over all the multiheaded creatures of falsehood that spawn in modern propaganda, diplomacy, and politics.

The comfort of this vision would have many applications, too. To the Lutherans who had languished under the Hitler regime and now suffer in the mines of eastern Europe, He might appear enthroned over the swastika and the hammer and the sickle. To the Protestant, suppressed by Roman imperialism, He would appear exalted over the triple tiara and the cardinals' crimson. To the fearful heart, He would appear in supreme might above the fissioned atom and the wings of the supersonic airplane. To the doubting souls, He would appear in undiminished glory over the triple A of the Association for the Advancement of Atheism and the laboratory instruments of science. God's children, take comfort.



Essays in Hermeneutics

By M. H. FRANZMANN

III. THE CIRCLE OF SCRIPTURE

Thou art good and doest good; teach me Thy statutes. Ps. 119:68.

"Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Heretofore, in the circle of language and in the circle of history, we have been concentrating on the fact that "men . . . spake," on the fact that God the Holy Ghost spoke in tongues in definite moments in history. We have been, therefore, concerned largely with the skills and techniques of interpretation. In the circle of Scripture we pass from skills and techniques to what is rather an attitude, a gift of God, a *charisma* to be prayed for. For we are now concerned with the fact that what was spoken by men in times past was uniquely spoken; that these men spoke as "men of God," as men "moved by the Holy Ghost." We are concerned with that aspect of the Bible which makes it different from all other texts, however much it may, linguistically and historically considered, have in common with them; upon the fact that it is the Word of God, not only the record of God's revelation of Himself, but the continuation of it; that here God not only spoke through men, but speaks.

Scripture being, then, not only a record of revelation, but itself the revelation of God, we are confronted immediately with the same sharp either-or that is involved in every contact with God: "In our relationship to God there is no such thing as neutrality. Whether we obey His Law or not, whether we believe His Gospel or not, whether we love Him or not, fear Him or not — always we can do only the one or the other. No third attitude is possible. Disobedience is not defective obedience, but an active decision against God; likewise, unbelief; likewise, not fearing Him. That is to say, that for which we decide when we decide against God is not a blank, not a non-entity, but is an act that absolutely determines our existence. In unbelief and in disobedience we have consigned ourselves, whether we know it or not, whether we want it so or not, to that other which is absolutely antagonistic to God." (Elert.) Hence Luther's constant insistence on what must be the first axiom in theological interpretation,

namely, that we be *under*, subject to, Scripture; what he calls "der Gehorsam des Worts." "Du und ich sollen unter dem Worte sein. Das Wort ist nicht mein und dein, darum will ich dich nicht ueber Gott setzen und dich nicht lassen recht haben, wo du unrecht bist." God is King, and His Word is supreme; we are bound to it: "An das goettliche Wort sollen wir gebunden sein, das sollen wir hoeren, und niemand soll ohne Gottes Wort aus seinem Kopfe etwas lehren." God's Word is not a force that we can guide or control; it guides and controls us: "Das Wort Gottes sollen wir nicht lenken, sondern [uns] von demselben lenken lassen." Against its authority, reason has no claim: "Wider alles, was die Vernunft eingibt oder ermessen und ausforschen will, ja was alle Sinne fuehlen, muessen wir lernen am Worte halten." Neither has our feeling, our experience, anything to say over against this authority; especially is this so in times of trial, when our feelings so readily run counter to revelation: "In der Zeit, wenn wir angefochten werden, sollen wir nicht nach unsern Empfindungen, sondern nach dem Worte Gottes urteilen." "Wir muessen nicht urteilen nach dem, was wir empfinden, sondern nach dem, was Gott selbst in seinem Wort ausspricht und urteilt." Only so can Scripture be grasped: "Das Wort Gottes ist so beschaffen, dass wenn man nicht alle Sinne schliesst und es allein mit dem Gehoer aufnimmt und ihm glaubt, man es nicht fassen kann." "Christus kann durch sein Wort nicht in die Herzen der Menschen einziehen, wenn sie nicht ihren Sinn gefangen geben unter den Gehorsam des Worts." We not only suspend judgment until we have heard the Word of God; we renounce our own judgment when we hear it; we must learn not to think above what is written: "Wo Gottes Wort gehet, soll man nicht fragen, ob es recht sei; was es heisst, das soll recht sein." We are not to seek beyond it: "Was uns im Wort nicht offenbart ist, soll man fahren lassen, denn ohne Gefahr und Schaden kann man sich daran nicht versuchen." To render the Word anything less than absolute obedience is to add to it something of our own, and the Word of God cannot tolerate adulteration: "Gottes Wort und Sachen koennen schlecht keinen Zusatz leiden, es muss ganz rein und lauter sein, oder ist schon verderbet und kein nutz mehr." Such an attitude of unconditional obedience will not be offended at the servant's

form of the Word either, its apparent weakness with which God's revelation of Himself begins: "Das ist die Art des goettlichen Wortes, dass, wenn es anfangen will, seine Kraft und Gewalt zu erzeugen, *es zuvor geschwaechet wird.*" Interpretation is, therefore, finally, a gift, not a skill or an achievement: "Die dem Worte anhangen, tun dies aus Gottes Gabe, nicht aus eigenen Kraefften, denn die Vernunft stoesset sich an dem Evangelium." It is a gift of Christ: "Das Wort kann ich nicht erdenken, sondern ich hoere es durch den Mund Christi, und ich kann es nicht verstehen, hoeren, lernen noch glauben, so er's nicht ins Herz gibt." It is a gift of the Holy Ghost, who makes us spiritual: "Soll ich die Worte verstehen, die ich hoere, so muss es geschehen durch den Heiligen Geist, der macht mich auch geistlich; das Wort ist geistlich, und ich werde auch geistlich." It was an appreciation of this basic attitude toward the Word of God that led Wilhelm Moeller to describe interpretation as "heiliges Schauen." And it was the absence of just this "Gehorsam des Worts" that made liberal exegesis so flat and unfruitful that the inevitable reaction has set in widely again, a reaction that we find voiced, for instance, in Donald G. Miller's review of Goodspeed's *How to Read the Bible*: "Is it very presumptuous to express concern that a book which comes from one who would be considered by many the dean of New Testament scholars in America, should be so lacking in religious content and so devoid of the Biblical point of view while writing about the Bible? Has not the day come when American Biblical scholarship should end the process — which surely must be complete by now — of judging the Bible by the shallow canons of twentieth-century complacent American liberal thought and with at least a little of the feeling of the man who beat upon his breast and cried, 'God be merciful to me, a sinner,' to begin the very disturbing and humbling process of permitting the Bible to judge us?"

This demand for submission to the text might be deemed an unreasonable one to make of the interpreter at the outset and as the opposite extreme from that open-mindedness (*Voraussetzungslosigkeit*) so often set up as the ideal of the interpreter's attitude toward the text to be interpreted. But is it really unreasonable to ask of the Christian student that he approach the Word to which he owes his new birth with

the reverence that befits a Word of such power and importance? His basic attitude toward Scripture has long ago been established by his position in Christ: "They are they which testify of Me." Our attitude toward Christ can never again be neutral or open-minded; we cannot even for the purpose of study assume an attitude of neutrality. The Christian interpreter might do well to write upon his desk what Luther used to write out before himself in hours of trial: "Baptizatus sum"—to remind him that Jesus Christ is his Lord and that the Word which testifies of Him is to be met with "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth."

And after all, this demand for complete open-mindedness in any field of interpretation is both impossible and wrong. Impossible, for no man comes to any text with a completely open mind, entirely without prepossessions. He has been conditioned to Shakespeare, for instance, a thousand ways before he ever opens a volume of Shakespeare: he has been exposed to rhythm, verse, and rhyme from his nursery days onward; he has been subjected to drama from kindergarten on; he has heard Shakespeare quoted, whether he knew it or not; he has heard his phrases in the mouth of everyman; even if his reading has been confined to billboards and the back pages of the *Saturday Evening Post*, he cannot have escaped Shakespeare entirely. And what child ever reached the age of six without being in some way touched by the influence of the Bible? At the very least, he has heard men curse and swear by the divine names which he meets in Scripture: that desecration of the holy is in itself a sort of satanic tribute to the power in those names and will have left its mark upon the man who heard it. (He has never heard anyone take the names of Thor or Baldur in vain.)

And the demand for open-mindedness, in the sense that it is made, is wrong also. For if a man would understand any text, he must at least begin by submitting himself to it. No one has achieved an understanding worthy the name of Homer or Milton or Goethe by remaining coolly above him. A man must submit himself to Homer if he would know Homer. He must submit himself fully and sympathetically to Milton if he is to know Milton. The demand for open-mindedness, for a prepossessionless approach, makes sense only in the form of the positive demand that man's mind be

really open to the text that he is to interpret, that, as Torm puts it, a man "begin by bowing willingly and obediently to the quiet influence of the text. He must, so to speak, give the text time to work upon himself by dint of its own internal power"; he must exclude norms and analogies that are foreign to the text and hear the text out on its own terms. Most schoolboys who end up by hating Horace as heartily as Byron did ("Then farewell, Horace, whom I hated so"), do so, not because Horace is "hard," but because they could not, or were not induced to, submit themselves to Horace and his charm. And so it is no unreasonable demand, even from an un-theological point of view, to ask the interpreter to begin by submitting himself to Scripture in order to understand it. There is, of course, this cardinal difference between submitting to Scripture and submitting to any other book: a man can, and ought to, detach himself again from the Horace or Homer to whom he has for a time sympathetically subdued himself; but — let the candid reader beware, and let him reckon the cost of the tower beforehand — he will never again be able to detach himself from Scripture once he has given himself to it unreservedly; for he will have been taken by a power and a love that will not let him go.

UNUS SIMPLEX SENSUS

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom"; this absolute submission to the Word is the beginning of all real interpretation, and from it all other theological norms of interpretation flow. So the one great Reformation principle of interpretation, that of the one intended sense of Scripture, is the inevitable outcome of this attitude toward the Word. If we are open-minded in the only admissible and fruitful sense of the word, that is, if we are under Scripture, we shall not be offended at the servant's form of God's Word. We shall accept Scripture as we find it, even as we accept the Son of Man, the sign that is spoken against, as we find Him, in His weakness and humility. We shall not deem it the business of interpretation to make Scripture more "spiritual" than the Holy Ghost has made it by going beyond the simple, literal sense of its words and embroidering upon the plain meaning additional mystical "senses" after the manner of much Patristic and most Medieval exegesis.

The old "fourfold sense" of Scripture has become so remote for us, the inheritors of the Lutheran Reformation, that we can hardly appreciate how great and bold a step Luther took when he declared that the simple, literal sense of Scripture is "Frau Kaiserin, die geht ueber alle subtile, spitzige, sophistische Dichtungen, von der muss man nicht weichen. . . ." This in opposition to the whole medieval theory and practice which, during the centuries of its sway, had taken the literal sense as a mere point of departure for the sometimes devout but always arbitrary development of the allegorical, the moral (or tropological), and the anagogical senses.

Litera gesto docet; quid credas, allegoria;
Moralis, quid agas; quo tendas, anagogia.

Thus "Jerusalem," in any context, might be literally the city of Judea; allegorically, the Church Militant; morally, every faithful soul; and anagogically, the heavenly Jerusalem. The burning bush that was not consumed might by this sort of "spiritual jugglery" (the term is Luther's) be made to signify the Mother of our Lord, who was not consumed by the Divine Fire in her womb; and in the "two or three firkins apiece" of John 2:6 an adept might find a reference to the two or three senses that Scripture might bear in addition to the literal.

To be sure, this mystical or allegorical mode of interpretation finds some apparent support in the occasional "allegorical" use of Old Testament incidents or figures in the New Testament. But the support is only apparent; for aside from the fact that this "allegorical" interpretation of the Old Testament is confined to a few instances, a cardinal difference is to be observed: "Whereas allegorical interpretation goes its own way alongside the literal sense (often independently of it, sometimes even excluding it), the typological interpretation [in the New Testament], or better, the typological view, of the text holds fast to the literal sense and is based upon it" (Torm). In other words, these instances of "allegory" in the New Testament are not so much interpretations of the Old Testament text, giving them an additional meaning, as a fresh *application* of them. "This allegorical sense is not a second sense of the words, but a second meaning of the contents of the words. Gal. 4:21-31." (Fuerbringer.)

We of the twentieth century deem ourselves, rather complacently, far above the vagaries of an Origen or a Thomas

Aquinas. The wild work of patristic or medieval exegesis cannot, we feel certain, happen here. And yet the history of exegesis in modern times offers abundant evidence that the simple Gospel is still an offense to many, that the unregenerate heart cannot take it as it is. Modern exegesis does not allegorize; but much of it has paltered with Scripture in a double sense nevertheless: after all, an exegesis that pares away the miraculous in the Gospels and ignores the Atonement in the life and death of Christ, that ethicizes the "religion of Jesus" and creates an unbridgeable gulf between Jesus and St. Paul, or brings down everything in the New Testament, *religionsgeschichtlich*, to the level of a first-century religious development, can hardly lay claim to dealing any more honestly with the text than the ancient practitioners of the four-fold sense.

SCRIPTURA SACRA SUI IPSIUS INTERPRES

From such an attitude of reverent submission to the Word there follows also the second great Reformation principle of interpretation, namely, that Scripture interprets itself. For such an attitude toward Scripture precludes any interpretation by an alien or imported norm, whether that norm be tradition, the consensus of the Church, "the spirit," enlightened reason or the Christian consciousness, a moral norm, a dogmatic system, or an assumed entity, such as the whole of Scripture. For as F. Pieper points out, such a treatment of Scripture is not an interpretation, but a criticism of it: "What Scripture does not itself interpret, no man shall make bold to interpret." It is worth while to remind ourselves again at this point that on this level skill in interpretation of Scripture is a gift. And like all God's gifts, it is given to the humble, to the poor in spirit, to the broken and contrite heart. An *aliquid in nobis* is as bad in interpretation as it is in the doctrine of conversion and predestination (F. Pieper). And so the really Christian exegete will follow Luther's advice: "Despair absolutely of your own sense and understanding. Pray with real humility and earnestness to God that He may through His dear Son give His Holy Spirit to illumine and guide you and to make you wise."

It is in this sense, Scripture as interpreter of Scripture, that Luther and our Confessions understood the *analogy of faith*. Luther uses "a public article of faith" and "Scripture"

interchangeably, and the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, Article 13, explains "regulam" by "scripturas certas et claras." The men of the Reformation "sought earnestly to place themselves under Scripture, in the full confidence that the God who had given the Scriptures to the Church had also given clear and distinct guides to their understanding, if one would only use them rightly" (Torm). Luther has given classic expression to this confidence, this faith, in the words: "Rest assured, beyond all doubt, that there is nothing brighter and clearer than the sun, that is, the Scriptures. If a cloud has come before it, there is still nothing else behind that cloud than this same bright sun. And so, if there is a dark saying in Scripture, there is surely behind it the same truth which is clearly expressed in another place." All the light that is needed, theologically, in Scripture is provided by Scripture itself.

Not as if the usefulness of the analogy of faith, or as it is also called, the analogy of Scripture, is exhausted in providing light for "dark sayings," though naturally that use looms largest in the formulation of doctrine and in polemics. Its greater day-by-day usefulness lies in the establishing of the content of theological concepts, the sort of work done in the great theological lexica of Cremer and of Kittel. The interpreter in seeking to determine just what and just how much a word like *χάρις* means will welcome whatever by-illumination etymology and secular usage can provide (though it be but by contrast). But his real questions are directed to Scripture itself, and it is from Scripture itself that he gets his decisive answers. It is to Scripture that he directs such questions as: In what applications is the idea found? What is predicated of it? What is contrasted with it? With what is it paralleled? What synonyms or near synonyms of the word occur? What is the history of the idea in the two Testaments? All of Scripture is made to cast light on any portion of it.

It is, of course, a piece of irreverence toward the Word if the analogy of faith is used to rationalize away tensions that Scripture itself has left unresolved, the tension, for instance, that for human rationality will always exist between the universal grace of God and the particular election of the saints. A really theological interpretation will never seek to rend God's veils nor pry into the hidden counsels of the Almighty.

True interpretation is better occupied. For in thus interpreting, always remaining under Scripture, we shall not only introduce no alien or imported norms; we shall also remain always under the influence of the same Spirit who first gave the Word to the Church. That Spirit is the Spirit of truth and will lead us to seek and find Christ as the whole content of Scripture. That does not mean that we are to allegorize and twist texts to find explicit reference to our Lord where none such exists. It does mean that we view and treat Scripture as an organic whole, with one Author, all the parts of which are vitally related to the one central theme of God's redemptive work in Christ. It is Christ, our Redeemer, whom we seek and find.

Practically, all this means that the concordance is more valuable than the dictionary; that the large dictionary with its systematized parallels is more valuable than the small dictionary; that theological lexica of the order of Cremer and Kittel are more valuable than merely lexical works; that the best part of a good commentary is often the collections of parallels from Scripture; that the margins of a Nestle are better than a good many commentaries; that the best of all is to be your own concordance of words and ideas, to do as Luther did, who read through all Scriptures twice a year, "bis ich ein ziemlich guter Textualis wurde."



Luther's Attitude Toward John Hus

By JAROSLAV PELIKAN, JR.

The history of the development of Protestantism in Eastern Europe is an area of church history to which comparatively little attention has been devoted. Because Protestantism is now relatively weak in the lands east of the Iron Curtain, many students of church history are inclined to forget that at one time the churches of the Reformation had millions of adherents in these lands which are now dominated by Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, and Soviet Communism.

In a previous issue of this journal we have called attention to an important chapter from the history of the Reformation in Poland.¹ In many ways, however, the Reformation in Bohemia is far more important, especially because of its relationship to Luther's Reformation. That relationship was climaxed in Luther's endorsement of the *Confessio Bohemica* of 1535. But the chief factor involved in the negotiations between Luther and the Bohemians was Luther's high regard for John Hus (ca. 1369—1415). It is the purpose of this paper to trace the development of Luther's feeling about Hus.²

I

Just when Luther first heard of Hus, and from whom, is difficult to determine. But it seems safe to say that his first knowledge of Hus and of the Hussites came when he was quite young. Luther's father was a miner, and the German miners of the latter half of the fifteenth century were in constant contact with Bohemia.³ German noblemen hired Czech artists, and vice versa. The contact between Germany and

¹ "The Consensus of Sandomierz," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XVIII (1947), 825—37.

² The first to try a comprehensive discussion of this development was the Russian scholar E. Novikof, *Gus i Luter* (2 vols.; Moskva, 1859). A less voluminous, but more penetrating study of the problem is that of Jaroslav Goll, "Jak soudil Luther o Husovi?" *Časopis musea kralovství českého*, 1880, 69 ff. Independent of the previous two, because, as he says, he cannot read "Ungarisch" (!), are the pertinent sections of Walter Koehler, *Luther und die Kirchengeschichte nach seinen Schriften*, I. (untersuchender) Teil, 1. Abteilung (Erlangen, 1900). Cf. also W. H. T. Dau, "Luther's Relation to Hus," in *Theological Quarterly*, XIX, 3 (July, 1915), pp. 129—163.

³ On the extent of the contacts between German and Czech miners, cf. S. Harrison Thomson, *Czechoslovakia in European History* (Princeton, 1943), pp. 101—02.

Bohemia can also be gauged through a study of the Czech, Moravian, and Silesian students at various German universities in this period;⁴ and one can glimpse the meaning of this academic contact if he pay particular attention to those who studied at Wittenberg.⁵

Much more conclusive than this tenuous evidence for an awareness of Hus among Luther's contemporaries is the fact that the memory of the Hussite Wars was still alive in the places where and among the people with whom Luther spent his early life. At least three times in his writings⁶ the Reformer indicates an acquaintance with German participation in those wars, and that is not surprising; for the city of Erfurt, whose university Luther entered early in 1501, had been a collecting place for the anti-Hussite taxes of the early and middle fifteenth century.⁷ In the German lower classes, too, the social upheavals of the Hussite period served as a reminder and an encouragement in their difficult lot.⁸

The extent of the awareness referred to above may well be gauged from the part played by Jan Žižka (d. Nov. 11, 1424) in the writings of Luther's contemporaries.⁹ Thus, for example, a colored picture of Žižka and of the Hussite armies decorates the cover of a sixteenth-century "Relatio historica

⁴ J. V. Šimák, "Studenti z Čech, Moravy a Slezka na německých universitách v XV.—XVII. století," *Časopis českého musea*, 1905; also J. O. Novotný, *Střední Slovensko* (Praha, 1937), I, pp. 150—59.

⁵ Ferdinand Menčík, "Studenti z Čech a Moravy ve Wittemberku od r. 1502 až do r. 1602," *Časopis českého musea*, 1897, 250—68; most of them, of course, came after 1530. For a handy summary see E. G. Schwiebert, *Reformation Lectures* (Valparaiso, 1937), Appendix B "Student Matriculation in the University of Wittenberg from 1520—1560," p. iv.

⁶ "Warnunge D. Martini Luther, An seine lieben Deutschen," *Werke* (Weimar, 1881 ff.; hereafter referred to as WA), 30—III, 281. Cf. his reference to the Germans as those "qui occidimus eum," "Schreiben an die boehmischen Landstaende," WA 10—II, 174; also "De instituendis ministris ecclesiae," WA 12, 171, and Ernst Schaefer, *Luther als Kirchenhistoriker* (Guetersloh, 1897), p. 459.

⁷ Cf. František Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého* (Praha, 1921), page 624.

⁸ See Wilhelm Vogt, *Die Vorgeschichte des Bauernkriegs* (Halle, 1887), pp. 57—83: "Das 'boehmische Gift' und seine Vorbereitung in Deutschland."

⁹ Jan Žižka of Trebova was the one-eyed leader of the Hussite armies. A sketchy discussion of Žižka's place in the humanistic literature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is offered by Karel Hrdina, "Žižka v humanistickém písemnictví XV. a XVI. století" in Rudolf Urbánek (ed.), *Sborník Žižkův 1424—1924* (Praha, 1924), pp. 196—99.

de Turcarum moribus." ¹⁰ And the German anticlericals ¹¹ of the time, notably Ulrich von Hutten, used Žižka as proof of the fact that an anticlerical revolt could be successful. ¹² This enthusiasm for Žižka was shared by others in the same period, ¹³ as well as by Luther's followers of a generation later. ¹⁴

As the Hussite Wars had not been forgotten, so, too, it was rumored about here and there that the condemnation of John Hus at Constance had not been completely legal and fair. ¹⁵ Luther became acquainted with these rumors from at least two sources. One of them was Johann Greffenstein, who told him that Hus "sey noch nie mit schriften ubirwunden." ¹⁶ Diligent study by Biereye, supplemented by Otto Scheel, ¹⁷ has failed to identify Greffenstein; but it seems safe to take 1505 as the *terminus ad quem* of the utterance. Similarly, he heard "von Andreas Proles" that Hus was defeated in debate by a Bible corrupted in the passage Ezekiel 34:10. ¹⁸ Now, Luther is said to have seen Proles "jam decrepitem" in Magdeburg in

¹⁰ Reprinted as plate 120 in the appendix to Urbánek, *op. cit.* The manuscript is — or, at least, was — preserved in Vienna.

¹¹ The attempt has recently been made to interpret both Hussitism and Hutten's admiration for it as an instance of class warfare rather than of anticlericalism; the argument appears highly tendential. Roman Jakobson, *Moudrost starých Čechů* (New York, 1943), pp. 170–72.

¹² *Gespraechen von Ulrich von Hutten uebersetzt und erlaeutert*, edited by David Friedrich Strauss as Part III of his *Ulrich von Hutten* (Leipzig, 1860), p. 209. For an interpretation see Paul Held, *Ulrich von Hutten* (Leipzig, 1928), pp. 146–47.

¹³ So Martin Bucer, or whoever it was that wrote *Gesprechbiechlein newen Karsthans*, edited with an introduction by Ernst Lehmann (Halle, 1930), p. 15. For this passage in its historical context, see Hajo Holborn, *Ulrich von Hutten and the German Reformation* (New Haven, 1937), page 179.

¹⁴ Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Catalogus testium veritatis* (Frankfurt, 1672), p. 733.

¹⁵ The extent of Hussite propaganda in Germany during this period is summarized by Lindsay, *A History of the Reformation*, I (New York, 1926), pp. 98 and 309.

¹⁶ "Von den newen Eckischenn Bullen und lügen," WA 6, 591. James Mackinnon doubts the effectiveness of Greffenstein's words at the time they were spoken, *Luther and the Reformation* (London, 1925–30), I, page 25.

¹⁷ *Martin Luther. Vom Katholizismus zur Reformation*, I (Tübingen, 1921), p. 306, on the relative merit of the view that Greffenstein was an Augustinian and of the theory that he was one of Luther's teachers.

¹⁸ "Von den newen Eckischenn Bullen und lügen," WA 6, 590.

1497.¹⁹ But it was probably not directly from Proles, but through Johann Staupitz,²⁰ that Luther heard the story.

What is the significance of these data? Ever since Flacius²¹ it has been customary to speak of Proles as a "pre-Reformer," to compare him with John the Baptist as a preparer of the way.²² On the basis of the data quoted above and similar indications, Ludwig Keller has sought to find such a "pre-Reformer" also in Staupitz, but in vain.²³ For Keller's is, as Theodor Kolde has shown, an artificial theory, based not upon an observation of the facts, but upon speculation.²⁴ Rather, it seems nearer to the truth to see in these facts an indication of an active spiritual life in the Augustinian order, a spiritual life which may well have recognized John Hus as the loyal son of the Church that he really was.²⁵

That indication is strengthened by the fact that there were books by Hus lying around in certain places where they could be read. That this was true of either Luther's monastery or his university is apparent from his own words.²⁶ From his quotations at the Leipzig Disputation in 1519 it seems that, despite his claim never to have read anything by Hus,²⁷ Luther had read the Acts of the Council of Constance carefully²⁸ and had also retained passages from Hus' *De ecclesia* not contained in the condemnatory decrees of that Council,²⁹ though

¹⁹ Melchior Adamus, *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum* (Heidelberg, 1620), p. 6.

²⁰ So Luther himself reports, WA, *Tischreden* (hereafter referred to as *Ti*), 4, 654.

²¹ Cf. his *Catalogus testium veritatis*, pp. 849—50.

²² So, for example, H. A. Proehle, *Andreas Proles, ein Zeuge der Wahrheit kurz vor Luther* (Gotha, 1867).

²³ *Johann von Staupitz und die Anfaenge der Reformation* (Leipzig, 1888).

²⁴ "Johann von Staupitz, ein Waldenser und Wiedertaeufer, eine kirchenhistorische Entdeckung beleuchtet," *Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte* (hereafter referred to as *ZKG*), 7 (1887).

²⁵ Cf. Hedwig Vonschott, *Geistiges Leben im Augustinerorden am Ende des Mittelalters und zu Beginn der Neuzeit* (Berlin, 1915).

²⁶ "Vorrede zu Confessio fidei ac religionis baronum et nobilium regni Bohemiae," WA 50, 379.

²⁷ Cf. Luther to Johann Staupitz, October 3, 1519, WA, *Briefe*, 2, 514, and "Von den neuen Eckischenn Bullen und lügen," WA 6, 587—88.

²⁸ "... als auch etlich acta selbs schreyben," "Von den neuen Eckischenn Bullen und lügen," WA 6, 591; cf. Luther and Carlstadt to the Elector Frederick, August 18, 1519, WA, *Briefe*, 2, 470.

²⁹ This was the conclusion reached by Theodor Kolde, *Luthers Stellung zu Konzil und Kirche bis zum Wormser Reichstag 1521* (Gutersloh, 1876), p. 47.

they may well have been recorded in other anti-Hussite writings. Nor is the possibility excluded that the books of Johann Wesel, of which Luther spoke highly,³⁰ provided him with information; for Wesel had been in close contact with the Bohemians and had addressed some treatises to them which made trouble for him.³¹

Luther's early experiences of John Hus can, therefore, be summarized thus: Although, in harmony with the ecclesiastical tradition, Luther was taught that Hus was a heretic to be avoided,³² there were nevertheless influences in his early life which gave him a proclivity for the Czech Reformer, a proclivity which made itself increasingly prominent as his reformatory thought progressed.

II

The first of Luther's opponents to recognize his affinity for Hus was probably either John Tetzel³³ or Sylvester Prierias, who received the impression upon reading some of Luther's words that "si talia in lucem dedisses quasi mox ad Bohemos commigraturus aut magnum aliquod ac latens adhuc scisma propalaturus."³⁴ Prierias' right to that priority is made questionable by the doubtful date of his "Replica";³⁵ but in any event, the fact that this is merely a passing remark and only one expletive among very many would tend to reduce its importance. There were probably others among Luther's opponents early in 1518 who hurled the name "Hussite" at him;³⁶ and it may well be that the use of that name

³⁰ "Von den Konziliis und Kirchen," WA 50, 600; also "Responsio Lutheriana," WA 6, 184.

³¹ Cf. Otto Clemen, "Wesel," *Realenzyklopaedie fuer die protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (3d ed.; 1896 ff.), 21, 129.

³² His references to "venenum sub melle," WA 50, 379, or to his mortal hatred for Hus, "In epistolam S. Pauli ad Galatos Commentarius," WA 40—I, 138, are probably exaggerated accounts. But it seems clear that he was warned about Hus: "Schreiben an die boehmischen Landstaende," WA 10—II, 172.

³³ Cf. Walter Koehler, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

³⁴ "Replica F. Silvestri Prieriatis, sacri Palatii apostolici Magistri, ad F. Martinum Luther Ordinis Eremitarum," WA 2, 51.

³⁵ Although some scholars date it earlier, Knaake puts it "wahrscheinlich Anfang November 1518," WA 2, 48.

³⁶ Cf. Luther to Johann Lang, March 21, 1518, WA, *Briefe*, 1, 154, on the many "portenta" with which his adversaries attempted to smear him.

was a common polemical device in the early sixteenth century.³⁷

Effective use was not made of the similarity between Luther and Hus, however, until the entry of Johann Eck into the controversies which had sprung up as a result of Luther's theses. Slightly younger than Luther, Eck was pro-chancellor at the University of Ingolstadt and inquisitor for Bavaria and Franconia. The publication of the Ninety-Five Theses moved him to break off his friendship with Luther and to write "Obelisca" against him sometime early in 1518. Here he takes exception to Luther's view of the Church, labeling it "Bohemicum virus."³⁸ Although his "Asterisca," written in reply, do not refer to this charge, Luther was struck by it.³⁹ And when, a year later, various accusations by Eck had begun to accumulate, Luther published a "Disputatio et excusatio," in which he first expressed criticism of the Council of Constance, where Hus had been excuted,⁴⁰ and ridiculed Eck's accusation of Hussitism by a reference to an inscription on the Lateran Church in Rome.⁴¹

Strengthened by this in his conviction that Luther was in league with the Hussites, Eck came to Leipzig in June, 1519, and on the twenty-seventh day of that month began his debate with Andreas Carlstadt. Rumor had it that there were some Bohemians in Leipzig for the disputation, who wanted to support Luther as a follower of Hus.⁴² When Luther was asked to preach, all the churches were closed to him, and he used the debate auditorium. His sermon, delivered on June 29, St. Peter's and St. Paul's day,⁴³ dealt with

³⁷ In an undated sermon on John 8, Luther compares the attacks on him as a Hussite to attacks on Christ as a Samaritan, WA 4, 614. For another instance, see Oskar Farnet, *Huldrych Zwingli*, II (Zuerich, 1946), page 331.

³⁸ Eck, "Obelisca" No. 18, WA, 1, 302.

³⁹ Cf. Luther to Johann Sylvius Egranus, March 24, 1518, WA Briefe, 1, 158; also Carlstadt to Eck, June 11, 1518, in *Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften* (Saint Louis Edition, hereafter referred to as *StL*), 15, 805.

⁴⁰ "Disputatio et excusatio F. Martini Luther adversus criminationes D. Iohannis Eccii," WA 2, 159. This holds if J. Knaake's reading "Constantipolitanam" is correct rather than "Constantinopolitanam" in other editions.

⁴¹ "... ut ipsa quoque Ecclesia Ecce sit Hussita," *ibid.*, p. 159.

⁴² Eck to Georg Hauen and Franz Burckardt, July 1, 1519, *StL* 15, 1228.

⁴³ "Ein Sermon von sanct Peters und Pauls fest," WA 2, 246-49.

grace and free will, and with the primacy of Peter. Because of its treatment of this latter point the sermon seemed to Eck to be Hussitic.⁴⁴ And so it is not surprising that when Luther chanced into the Paulist church one morning while the fathers were reading mass, they ran away with their monstrosities for fear of being contaminated by the heretic.⁴⁵

On July 4, 1519, after the preliminary bout between Eck and Carlstadt was over, the debate between Eck and Luther began. Before the morning had passed, Eck took occasion to refer to the fact that "cum summa Christianorum iniuria sumus experti portas infernorum prevaluisse ecclesie Hierosolymitane . . . addo quoque Boemice."⁴⁶ Luther's reply mentioned the Bohemians, and no more.⁴⁷ But the next day Eck pressed his point, acknowledging himself as an enemy of the schismatic Bohemians and citing the resemblance between their position and Luther's on the controverted points; "fateor, quod Bohemi in suorum errorum pertinaci defensione illa commemorant," he added, "et his armis virulentis se defendunt."⁴⁸ While granting that the Bohemians sinned by breaking the highest law of Christian love,⁴⁹ Luther expressed his amazement that so avid an opponent of the Bohemians as Eck had never taken the time to write against them.⁵⁰ Although he attempted at first to sidestep the issue about his agreement with Hus and his disagreement with the Council of Constance,⁵¹ he was ultimately forced to defend Hus and even to grant that the Bohemians had been wronged; for

⁴⁴ Eck to Jacob Hochstraten, July 24, 1519, *StL* 15, 1227; cf. Eck to Hauen and Burckardt, July 1, 1519, *StL* 15, 1228.

⁴⁵ Sebastian Froeschel, Preface to "Vom Koenigreich Jesu Christi und seinem ewigen Priesterthum," *StL* 15, 1208; cf. W. H. T. Dau, *The Leipzig Debate in 1519* (St. Louis, 1919), p. 130.

⁴⁶ "Disputatio Excellentium theologorum Iohannis Eckii et Martini Lutheri Augustiniani," WA 2, 262.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, WA 2, 266.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, WA 2, 275; cf. also Eck's *Ad malesanam Lutheri venationem* of October 28, 1519, preserved in the Pritzlaff Memorial Library, leaf 4 B; and Eck to the Elector Frederick, November 18, 1519, *StL* 15, 1317.

⁴⁹ "Disputatio," WA 2, 275; for an interpretation cf. Erich Seeberg, *Luthers Theologie*, II: *Christus. Wirklichkeit und Urbild* (Stuttgart, 1937), p. 226.

⁵⁰ "Disputatio," WA 2, 276; see also the curious misreading of this passage in Heinrich Boehmer, *Road to Reformation* (Philadelphia, 1946), page 285.

⁵¹ On the Council, "Disputatio," WA 2, 283; on Hus, *ibid.*, p. 288.

many of Hus' articles were most Christian and evangelical.⁵² With inexorable logic, Eck concluded that if Luther supported Hus, whom Constance had condemned, then Luther was putting his own judgment above that of the Council.⁵³

III

Eck's strategy had worked, his suspicions were confirmed: Luther was a Hussite and had been forced to admit it. And now that Luther's identity with the Hussites was established, Eck determined to take full advantage of the situation. A few months after the debate he tried to use the Hussite bogey to scare Luther's protector, Frederick,⁵⁴ but the attempt failed. Less than a year after that, in October, 1520, he published a tract in criticism of what Luther had said and written since Leipzig.⁵⁵ There was much that displeased him, most of all Luther's growing friendship for Hus and the Hussites. This friendship did not surprise him, for Luther seemed to have much in common with the Bohemian heretics.⁵⁶ Indeed, in June, 1520, Luther had urged that attempts be made to conciliate the Czechs, since an injustice had been done them⁵⁷ — a charge that irked Eck very much.⁵⁸ In his pamphlet on the Lord's Supper of December, 1519, Luther had even sug-

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 297. Eck referred to this statement eleven years later in the thirtieth of his *Theses* 405, reprinted in Wilhelm Gussmann, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des augsburgischen Glaubensbekenntnisses*, II (Kassel, 1930), p. 107. Because the disputation was in public, it is, I think, correct to see in this action, as Hartmann Grisar does, proof that Luther was "in die Enge gebracht," *Martin Luther*, I (Freiburg, 1911), p. 295.

⁵³ "Disputation," WA 2, 299. He insisted especially that Luther's view of the Church as the company of the elect "ad Hussiticam intelligentiam, est hereticissimum," *ibid.*, p. 295. For the place of this in the debate and in Luther's development, cf. Karl Holl, "Die Entstehung von Luthers Kirchenbegriff," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, I: *Luther* (6th ed.; Tuebingen, 1932), p. 312, n. 3.

⁵⁴ Eck to Frederick, November 18, 1519, StL 15, 1317.

⁵⁵ "Des heiligen concilii tzu Costentz, der heylgen Christenheit und hochloeblichen keyzers Sigmunds, und auch des teutzschen adels entschuldigung etc.," reprinted in Karl Meisen und Friedrich Zoepfl (ed.), Johann Eck, *Vier deutsche Schriften* (Muenster in Westfalen, 1929), pages 1—18.

⁵⁶ Eck, "Entschuldigung," pp. 17—18.

⁵⁷ "An christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des christlichen Standes Besserung," WA 6, 454.

⁵⁸ He quotes Luther's words on the title page of the "Entschuldigung" and again later (p. 14), labeling them as "den grossen frevel . . . des keynen frummen Christen nicht tzu gedulden ist."

gested the permissibility of Communion under both kinds,⁵⁹ an indication to Eck that Luther preferred the practice of the heretics to the custom of the orthodox Church.⁶⁰ And what was even worse in Eck's eyes,⁶¹ Luther had urged compromise with those Bohemians, who doubted the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation and had also himself declared that doctrine to be a fiction.⁶² It was, therefore, with renewed confidence in the correctness of his tactics at Leipzig that Eck could throw the approval of Hus up to Luther in the presence of the Emperor at the Diet of Worms.⁶³ And even in 1530 he referred to Luther's previous denunciation of the Bohemians⁶⁴ and called him "der Pickardisch Luther,"⁶⁵ insisting that "Luttero enim debemus . . . novos Hussitas."⁶⁶

Once established by Eck, Luther's affinity with Hus and the Hussites was exploited by his enemies; and it soon became the usual practice in a polemic against Luther to refer to his "Hussitism." Thus, when Luther made his fateful admission about Hus at Leipzig, Duke George of Saxony, himself of Czech blood,⁶⁷ arose with arms akimbo and cried: "Das walt

⁵⁹ "Sermon von dem hochwirdigen sacrament des heyligen waren leychnams Christi und von den bruederschafften," WA 2, 742-43. Luther lived to regret some of the phrases in this "Sermon"; cf. "Ein brieff an die zu Franckfort am Meyn" of 1533, WA 30-III, 563. For the effect of this pamphlet on Duke George, cf. note 69 below. On the *sub utraque* in Luther's thought see also WA 6, 138. As often, Carlstadt was ahead of Luther in considering this problem, as evidenced by his thesis of July 19, 1521: "Non sunt Bohemi, sed veri Christiani, panem et poculum Christi sumentes," Hermann Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt* (Leipzig, 1905), I, p. 291, n. 118; also the Wittenberg faculty to the Elector, October 20, 1521, in *Corpus Reformatorum* (Halle, 1834 ff.), 1, 469 on the accusation that one holding to the *sub utraque* is a Bohemian. For Luther's interpretation of the incident, cf. "Von beider Gestalt des Sakraments zu nehmen," WA 10-II, 11-41, esp. p. 17, where he refers to Bohemia.

⁶⁰ "Entschueldigung," p. 4; Henry VIII's "Adsertio," StL 19, 146.

⁶¹ ". . . ich noch fuer unleidlicher acht," "Entschueldigung," p. 5.

⁶² "An christlichen Adel," WA 6, 456.

⁶³ According to Aleander's report, Eck listed the sympathy with Hus as one of the worst offenses of Luther's early writings, WA 7, 836. Cf. also Eck's reply to Luther's arguments, *ibid.*, p. 837.

⁶⁴ *Christliche erhaltung der stell der geschrift fuer das Fegfeuer wider Luthers lasterbuechlin* (August, 1530), leaf 4 B. This work, too, is preserved in Pritzlaff Memorial Library.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, leaf 16 B.

⁶⁶ "Praefatio" to *Theses* 405, Gussmann, *op. cit.*, II, p. 101.

⁶⁷ So, at least, it was claimed, Luther to Amsdorf, January 2, 1526, WA, *Briefe*, 4, 3; see the note to J. K. Seidemann, "Schriftstuecke zur Reformationsgeschichte," *Zeitschrift fuer historische Theologie*, 44 (1874), 120.

die Sucht!"⁶⁸ When the above-mentioned pamphlet on the Lord's Supper appeared,⁶⁹ and when Luther published essays and books praising Hus,⁷⁰ the theologizing duke feared that the heresiarch's influence would assert itself in his land, too.⁷¹ Royalty was joined to nobility in that denunciation when Henry of England expressed the thought that perhaps Luther would flee to the Bohemians if the situation in Germany grew too hot for him⁷² — a rumor that had been current for some time.⁷³ Ever the politician, Henry used the example of the Bohemians to warn the Saxon dukes of what continued toleration of Luther might mean.⁷⁴ The rumor which had come to Henry's ears about Luther's trips to Bohemia eventually grew, so that he was said to be a Czech himself, born and reared in Prague.⁷⁵ In 1528 a book appeared under the name of J. Faber, comparing Luther unfavorably with Hus;⁷⁶ George Witzel took Luther's Smalcald Articles as an occasion to remind Luther of what he had written to the Bohemians in 1523;⁷⁷ and ultimately even Erasmus joined in.⁷⁸ Johann

⁶⁸ According to Froeschel's report, quoted by Karl Friedrich Koehler, "M. Sebastian Froeschel," *Zeitschrift fuer historische Theologie*, 42 (1872), 535.

⁶⁹ Duke George to Elector Frederick of Saxony, December 27, 1519, *StL* 19, 450—51.

⁷⁰ Duke George to Luther, December 28, 1525, *WA, Briefe*, 3, 648.

⁷¹ Duke George to Elector Frederick of Saxony, December 27, 1519, *StL* 19, 450—51; and Frederick's answer, December 29, 1519, *StL* 19, 452—53.

⁷² "Adsertio septem sacramentorum," *StL* 19, 149.

⁷³ Cf. note 34 above; also Conrad Pellicanus to Luther, March 15, 1520, *WA, Briefe*, 2, 67; Silvester von Scharmberg to Luther, June 11, 1520, *WA, Briefe*, 2, 121; Luther to Spalatin, July 10, 1520, *WA, Briefe*, 2, 137.

⁷⁴ Henry to Elector Frederick, Dukes John and George, February 20, 1523, *StL* 19, 357.

⁷⁵ He first heard of the rumor early in 1520: Luther to Spalatin, January 10, 1520, *WA, Briefe*, 1, 608; it was substantiated a few days later, Luther to Spalatin, January 14, 1520, *WA, Briefe*, 1, 610; see also Luther to Johann Lang, January 26, 1520, *WA, Briefe*, 1, 619; and "Verklaerung etlicher Artikel in dem Sermon von dem heiligen Sakrament," *WA* 6, 81—82.

⁷⁶ It was called: "Nonaginta articuli, in quibus Joan. Hus et Pighardi, Waldenses ac Wesseliuss tractabiliores ac meliores Martino Luthero inveniuntur," Gussmann, *op. cit.*, II, p. 45.

⁷⁷ "Antwort auff Martin Luthers letzt bekennete artickel, unsere gantze religion und das concili belangend" (1538), edited by Hans Volz (Muenster, 1932), p. 106.

⁷⁸ "Purgatio adversus epistolam non sobriam Lutheri," quoted in Grisar, *op. cit.*, I, p. 82.

Fisher summarized the feelings of many when he stated that "Iohannes Husz pontificem Romanum totius ecclesiae divino iure monarcham profitetur, Lutherus contra penitus reclamatur."⁷⁹

IV

Sooner or later someone was bound to see the dangers connected with identifying Luther and the Hussites. Despite its disadvantages for the theory of papal supremacy, the Bohemian schism did perform the function of preventing the formation of a bloc against Rome. But if Luther were to take Hus' part in the controversy, might that not effect such a bloc, brought on by the loyal Roman Catholics who had used the Hussite stratagem to force Luther into a heretical position?

That danger was a real one, and something had to be done about it. The most obvious way to accomplish this was to play one Bohemian group against another and thus to irritate the disunity in the Bohemian situation as a lever against the chances of Luther's uniting with the Czechs. Such a thought seems to have occurred already to Eck, since he was concerned about the pious Czechs.⁸⁰ But it remained for Hieronymus Emser, one of Eck's cronies, to take concrete steps in that direction. While in the service of Duke George, Emser had an opportunity to travel in Bohemia;⁸¹ and on this trip, or a similar one, he acquired a Bohemian mistress.⁸² Feeling that such a connection with Bohemia imposed upon him the duty of setting Czech affairs straight, Emser wrote an essay for the faithful Czechs a month after the Leipzig Debate.⁸³ After calling Bohemia a "terra . . . supstitionis & confusionis" and lamenting the fact that the religious situation had even divided families,⁸⁴ the treatise goes on to show that there was no connection between Luther's position and that of the Czechs, and that Luther had repudiated the role

⁷⁹ "Epistola dedicatoria" to *Sacri Sacerdotii Defensio contra Lutherum*, edited by Hermann Klein Schmeink (Muenster, 1925), p. 6.

⁸⁰ So, at least, it seems from his letter to the Elector Frederick, July 22, 1519, *StL* 15, 1287.

⁸¹ Gustav Kawerau, *Hieronymus Emser* (Halle, 1898), p. 18.

⁸² Luther ridiculed Emser about this liaison, "Ad aegocerotem Emserianum M. Lutheri additio," *WA* 2, 661; other references in Kawerau, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

⁸³ *De disputatione Lipsicensi, quantum ad Boemos obiter deflexa est*. There is an old edition of this epistle in Pritzlaff Memorial Library.

⁸⁴ *De disputatione*, leaf 1 A.

of being a patron of Hus and the Czechs. Emser appealed to the leader of the Czech Catholics to rally to the cause of Church and country.⁸⁵ Luther recognized the significance of Emser's treatise, exclaiming: "Nova miracula, qui ab Eccio delyrabar esse Boemus, ab Emserio mihi infensiore quam multi Eccii Boemus esse abnegor";⁸⁶ but he still condemned the schismatic Bohemians⁸⁷ and so did not enter into the alliance of which Emser and his coreligionists were so afraid.

Nevertheless, as Luther's contacts with the Czechs grew, Emser's fears spread among other Catholics. Illustrative of the situation in which Luther's opponents found themselves is Johann Cochlaeus (1479–1552). He may himself have come from a Slavic family — his real name was Dobneck⁸⁸ — and was in contact with Bohemia, both through personal visits⁸⁹ and particularly through correspondence with various people there. He carried on an extensive correspondence especially with Pietro Paolo Vergerio (1497–1564), papal legate in Prague,⁹⁰ from whom, among other things, Cochlaeus sought financial help from the legacy of a wealthy Czech for historical and polemical writing,⁹¹ chiefly against Luther. The character of that writing is apparent from his history of the Waldenses,⁹² in which he recorded, as he said, "articulos haereticorum, quos approbat noster antipapa."⁹³

But more important than his Waldensian study was Cochlaeus' research in Hussite history. In his *magnum opus* in this field, which is useful even today⁹⁴ and which caused

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, leaf 3 A. For another example of Emser's use of Hus in polemic see Barge, *Karlstadt*, I, p. 395.

⁸⁶ "Ad Aegocerotem Emserianum M. Lutheri Additio," WA 2, 658.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 661–63.

⁸⁸ Theodor Kolde, "Cochlaeus," *Realenzyklopaedie*, 4, 194.

⁸⁹ Cf. Cochlaeus to Aleander, written from Prague, April 12, 1534, ZKG 18, 247; W. Friedensburg's note, ZKG 18, 270; and Cochlaeus to Cardinal Farnese, June 18, 1540, ZKG 18, 433.

⁹⁰ See Karl Benrath, "Vergerio," *Realenzyklopaedie*, 20, 546–50.

⁹¹ Cochlaeus to Vergerio, December 24, 1533, ZKG 18, 242; March 14, 1534, ZKG 18, 243; April 27, 1534, ZKG 18, 249; July 27, 1534, ZKG 18, 254.

⁹² On the progress of this writing, which was apparently the reworking of an older manuscript, see Cochlaeus to Aleander, May 5, 1521, ZKG 18, 111; Cochlaeus to Aleander, June 11, 1521, ZKG 18, 115; his complaint to the Pope, June 19, 1521, ZKG 18, 117; and his desire to revise it, Cochlaeus to Aleander, September 27, 1521, ZKG 18, 125.

⁹³ Cochlaeus to Aleander, May 11, 1521, ZKG 18, 112; on Luther as "antipapa," cf. Cochlaeus to Morone, March 19, 1538, ZKG 18, 284.

⁹⁴ See Joseph Sauer, "Cochlaeus," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 4, 79.

him much grief while he was writing it,⁹⁵ he purposed to expose "utrurumque Hussitarum, Bohemicorum et Teuthonicorum, malicia et perniciosa machinatio."⁹⁶ As a result of these researches, Cochlaeus was quite free in applying the name "Hussite" to Luther⁹⁷ and in blaming Hussite influences for Luther's doctrinal aberrations.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, Cochlaeus seems to have had fears similar to those of Emser, with whom he was in constant contact and whose opinion and work he highly respected.⁹⁹ But there were factors in the religious and political situation that made Cochlaeus even more apprehensive than was Emser about driving Luther and the Czechs together.

Perhaps chief among those factors for Cochlaeus was the Polish question. Emser had feared a tie-up of Luther and the Czechs; Cochlaeus feared the influence of the Lutheran movement upon other lands throughout Europe, but especially upon Poland. He frequently referred to the fact that one of the chief purposes of his writing was the prevention of the spread of the Lutheran heresy outside Germany,¹⁰⁰ and also the counteracting of the influence of Luther's translated books.¹⁰¹ Being probably quite aware of the many churches which the *Unitas Fratrum* had in Poland, Cochlaeus must have known of the intense struggle that had been going on in Poland for over a century, with the lower clergy supporting the

⁹⁵ Cochlaeus to Aleander, June 25, 1535, ZKG 18, 265; Cochlaeus to Johann Fabri, October 28, 1534, ZKG 18, 258. The book was put on the Index by Sixtus V: Kolde, "Cochlaeus," p. 200.

⁹⁶ Cochlaeus to Aleander, September 8, 1534, ZKG 18, 256-57; he wanted to defend the Apostolic See, Cochlaeus to Vergerio, July 27, 1534, ZKG 18, 254.

⁹⁷ Luther is referred to as "novus Hussita," Cochlaeus to Pope Leo, June 19, 1521, ZKG 18, 116; Hus is referred to as Luther's "magister" in Cochlaeus' *Articuli CCCC Martini Lutheri* (1526), art. 63. This latter writing is also in Pritzlaff Memorial Library, Saint Louis.

⁹⁸ On the doctrine of the Church, Cochlaeus' *Articuli*, art. 159; on purgatory, *ibid.*, art. 109, also note 64 above; on miracles at holy places, *Articuli*, art. 154; on the mass and other ceremonies, *ibid.*, art. 220; in general, Luther and his followers preach "Hussitica et Pighardica iam olim damnata dogmata," *ibid.*, art. 113.

⁹⁹ "... solus Emserus perstat invictus," Cochlaeus to Aleander, September 27, 1521, ZKG 18, 124; on Emser's answer to "An christlichen Adel," Cochlaeus to Aleander, May 22, 1521, ZKG 18, 114.

¹⁰⁰ Cochlaeus to Ottonello Vida, July 26, 1536, ZKG 18, 268; Cochlaeus to Vergerio, June 2, 1534, ZKG 18, 253; Cochlaeus to Aleander, September 8, 1534, ZKG 18, 257; Cochlaeus to Vergerio, July 27, 1534, ZKG 18, 254.

¹⁰¹ Cochlaeus to Vergerio, June 2, 1534, ZKG 18, 253.

Hussites and the higher clergy, with German backing, advocating the eradication of the Hussite heresy.¹⁰² That situation was still in a state of flux in the sixteenth century, and any strong unifying force might have brought about a realignment. Of this Cochlaeus was afraid — of an alliance between Poland, Bohemia, and Lutheran Saxony against Rome.

Cochlaeus' fears regarding the young Polish noblemen who were enrolled at Wittenberg have been described elsewhere.¹⁰³ When it was rumored about that one of the Polish bishops was inviting Melanchthon to Poland¹⁰⁴ and that even the young Polish king was "lutherico fermento infectus,"¹⁰⁵ he began to write profusely. He was overjoyed when the Polish king forbade his nobles to send their sons to Wittenberg to study, attributing the success of this to his books and to the grace of God.¹⁰⁶ But what he feared almost happened anyway in 1537, when reports came that some of Melanchthon's noble Polish pupils were plotting a rebellion "non modo contra episcopos, sed etiam contra regem ipsum."¹⁰⁷ The rebellion failed to materialize, but Cochlaeus was never completely certain of Poland's relation to the Church of Rome.

Because of such fears, it is not surprising to learn that Cochlaeus was careful about how he dealt with Luther-Hus polemics. As noted above, he did call Luther a Hussite. And while he could not avoid seeing and pointing out affinities between Luther's position and that of the Hussites, notably on the Eucharist,¹⁰⁸ he took every chance to point out that Luther was now guilty of what he had criticized in the

¹⁰² Cf. Ed. Dav. Schnaase, "Die boehmischen Brueder in Polen und die Reformierten in Danzig," *Zeitschrift fuer historische Theologie*, 37 (1867), 125—56. For more detailed bibliography, see my article on the Consensus of Sandomierz, referred to in note 1 above.

¹⁰³ "The Consensus of Sandomierz," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XVIII (1947), p. 831; see also the statistics cited there, p. 837.

¹⁰⁴ Cochlaeus to Aleander, April 23, 1534, ZKG 18, 248. The arrangements were being made through Andrew Krzycki; cf. Theodor Wotschke, *Geschichte der Reformation in Polen* (Leipzig, 1911), p. 27.

¹⁰⁵ Cochlaeus to Vergerio, July 27, 1534, ZKG 18, 255; *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergaenzten Aktenstuecken*, I (Gotha, 1892), No. 108, p. 291.

¹⁰⁶ Cochlaeus to Aleander, June 25, 1535, ZKG 18, 265.

¹⁰⁷ Cochlaeus to Aleander, October 7, 1537, ZKG 18, 275—76.

¹⁰⁸ See note 98 above; on the Eucharist, *Articuli CCCC*, art. 422; and Cochlaeus to Morone, August 31, 1537, ZKG 18, 272.

Czechs,¹⁰⁹ namely, the perversion of the Scriptures in proof of a position¹¹⁰ and particularly the sectarianism to which Luther had often pointed.¹¹¹ This he did, of course, to show the Czechs, as had Emser, that Luther was different from them. Another strategy he employed for that same purpose was his aid to Catholic Czechs. Among them was John Hasenberg, for whom he secured financial assistance.¹¹² He performed the same favor for four Czech noblemen.¹¹³ The provost of All Saints' Church in Prague, Simon Villaticus, managed to publish his poems in Leipzig through Cochlaeus' intercession.¹¹⁴ So concerned was Cochlaeus about the problem of Luther's alliance with the Hussites that he hoped to use the Czechs as a lever to bring the Germans back to the Church¹¹⁵ and wanted to revise his history of the Hussites to avoid offending the Czechs.¹¹⁶ And though he pretended to be shocked¹¹⁷ at Luther's statement of 1520 that "si ille [Hus] fuit haereticus, ego plus decies haereticus sum,"¹¹⁸ it actually gave him an opportunity to continue his strategy by granting Luther's point.¹¹⁹

But Cochlaeus' attempts were in vain. The forces which Eck had set in motion at Leipzig were too strong to be checked; and by the time Luther's enemies had become aware of the dangers latent in the Hussite myth, Luther's friends and Luther himself had willingly accepted the charge and were acquainting themselves with Hus and his views.

¹⁰⁹ *Articuli CCCCC*, art. 152 and 243.

¹¹⁰ *Confutatio XCI. articulorum* (Cologne, 1525), art. 66. Like other works previously cited, this tract is preserved in Pritzlaff Library.

¹¹¹ Cf. note 49 above; WA 1, 625; WA 1, 697. See Cochlaeus, "Ein noetig und christlich bedencken auff des Luthers artickeln, die man gemeynsamem concilio fuertragen sol," edited by Hans Volz (Muenster, 1932), p. 7.

¹¹² Cochlaeus to Vergerio, March 14, 1534, ZKG 18, 243; May 29, 1534, ZKG 18, 252.

¹¹³ Cochlaeus to Bishop Giberti, January 31, 1540, ZKG 18, 422-23.

¹¹⁴ Cochlaeus to Morone, January 12, 1538, ZKG 18, 282; and Johann Metzler in *Tres Orationes Funebres in Esequio Iohannis Eckii Habitae* (Muenster, 1930), p. iv; a sample of Villaticus' poetry is on p. 7.

¹¹⁵ Cochlaeus to Johann Fabri, October 28, 1534, ZKG 18, 259.

¹¹⁶ Cochlaeus to Vergerio, November 16, 1535, ZKG 18, 266.

¹¹⁷ *Articuli CCCCC*, art. 228; "Ein noetig . . . bedenken," p. 7.

¹¹⁸ "Assertio omnium articulorum M. Lutheri per bullam Leonis X. novissimam damnatorum," WA 7, 135.

¹¹⁹ *Commentarius de actis et scriptis Mt. Lutheri* (German translation, 1581), p. 550.

V

As late as 1522 some of Luther's friends were still defending him against the Hussite charge.¹²⁰ But soon after, Otto Brunfels became the first of the Evangelicals to publish some of Hus' works. More significant was the work done by Johann Agricola in acquainting himself and others with the life of Hus.¹²¹ In 1529 he collaborated with Nicholas Krumbacher in the publication of a "History und warhafftige geschicht" about Hus; it was published in Hagenau, the same city in which Hus' *De ecclesia* had come out for foreign consumption for the first time.¹²² The treatise is largely a collection of documents—letters, reports and speeches—dealing with Hus' defense at Constance.¹²³ In 1536, after moving to Wittenberg, Agricola published a German translation of Luther's edition of some of Hus' letters; the next year there appeared a "Disputatio Iohannis Hus, quam absoluit dum ageret Constantia," containing various tracts by Hus; and in 1538 Agricola wrote a five-act drama of Hus' martyrdom.¹²⁴ It was this last piece of work¹²⁵ which moved Cochlaeus to compose a dialog between Luther and a friend proving that the Council of Constance was correct in condemning Hus.¹²⁶ Because of all this activity on Agricola's part, it is not surprising that it should have been Agricola who wrote the preface to the *Apologia* of the *Unitas Fratrum*, when that document appeared in 1538.¹²⁷

¹²⁰ Cf. the anonymous "Ein kurze anred zu allen misgunstigen doctor Luthers, und der christenlichen Freiheit" in Oskar Schade (ed.), *Satiren und Pasquille aus der Reformationszeit* (2d ed.; Hanover, 1863), II, p. 191.

¹²¹ Agricola's research and publicistic activity in this field are well summarized in the chapter "Hussitica" in Gustav Kawerau, *Johann Agricola von Eisleben* (Berlin, 1881), pp. 118–28.

¹²² Jan Jakubec, *Dejiny literatury české*, I (Praha, 1929), p. 316.

¹²³ Although I have been unable to find a copy of Agricola's original, there is what seems to be a second edition in the Pritzlaff Memorial Library. The book is anonymous and bears the title: "Die in Huszen bekriegte, doch unbesiegte Wahrheit" (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1686); cf. page 4.

¹²⁴ See the selections from it in Kawerau, *Agricola*, pp. 120–21.

¹²⁵ Cf. Cochlaeus to Aleander, October 7, 1537, ZKG 18, 277.

¹²⁶ *Ein heimlich gespraech von der tragedia Johannis Huszen*, edited by Hugo Holstein (Halle, 1900). Kawerau, *Agricola*, p. 122, n. 2, seeks to disprove Cochlaeus' authorship, but his arguments are not convincing.

¹²⁷ Cf. Georg Loesche, *Luther, Melanchthon und Calvin in Oesterreich-Ungarn* (Tuebingen, 1909), p. 55.

Such were the forces, hostile and friendly, which brought Luther to the conviction that he was supporting the same cause for which, a hundred years before, John Hus had lived a hero's life and died a martyr's death. The development of Luther's attitude toward Hus is important for the entire history of Protestantism in Eastern Europe, since it was chiefly through this attitude that relations between the Reformation and Eastern lands were stimulated. It is no less significant for the light it sheds on Luther's "Entwicklung zum Reformator" and on the evolution of his reformatory consciousness, for which his attitude toward Hus is a helpful barometer. Luther's appreciation of Hus also helps explain why, in 1538, he was willing to endorse a confessional document, the *Confessio Bohemica*, which was not completely Lutheran in every respect. It is to this latter problem, valuable for the present ecclesiastical and theological crisis, that we hope to turn in a later article.

Valparaiso, Ind.

Homiletics

The Nassau Pericopes

THE DAY OF THANKSGIVING

2 THESS. 1:3

The Text and the Day. — The day very easily degenerates into thankfulness for material blessings. Introit, Collect, and regular readings direct chief attention to the spiritual ingredients in Thanksgiving — recognition of God's plans for the soul and of His provision for the whole life of man. This text singles out the crucial area of Christian growth in the Church.

Notes on Meaning. — Some things in the Church seem not praiseworthy: persecutions and tribulations, v. 4. Nevertheless the Church needs to give thanks, v. 3: "We are bound," "it is meet." This urgency of Christian thanksgiving is not a grim demand of God, but has its reason in the nature of the Christian people, and the persecutions and tribulations have simply served to bring out this praiseworthy fact. That fact is that the members of the Christian congregation have had a faith which grew and a love which was very rich toward one another. Faith is that hold on the merciful God by which the Christian is sure of the forgiveness of sins and grows in Christian grace and life through the power of God. Love is the all-inclusive proof of this life in the Christian. Its first objective is the fellow Christian in the congregation.

Preaching Pitfalls. — "We are bound" should not be set forth to stress duty which God demands, but as a situation which the living faith and love of the congregation makes self-evidently necessary. Christians are to thank God because He is the Source of this faith and love; He Himself is the Agent of the precious growth in the congregation.

Preaching Emphases. — The preacher will be careful to insert the Christological implications of "faith" and "charity." They are set forth throughout the remainder of the chapter; the accident of the textual segment should not delimit this textual emphasis. — The plot to the entire section is that God Himself, even by using the difficulties of the people, and through the Gospel of Christ (v. 10), is the Worker of faith and love.

Problem and Goal. — The problem is not explicit in this text, but is in the day, namely, that Christians thank God simply for those comforts which gratify their own physical senses. The goal of this text is to make Christians thankfully aware of the activity of God in nurturing the spiritual life of the congregation and to make them aware of the fact that their fellow Christians are the first object of their gratitude.

Outline:

THANK GOD FOR HIS CHIEF HARVEST

- I. God is indeed at work in the world.
 - A. We are grateful for the harvest and for His supply of physical needs.
 - B. But we need to learn to be grateful also for His supply of trial and testing, persecution and tribulation. To that end we must understand what His chief harvest is.
- III. The souls of His Church are God's chief harvest.
 - A. For that harvest He prepared in the sending of His Son.
 - B. He has sowed the seed of His Spirit through the Gospel of the Son.
 - C. Thereby He has created faith in Christians — His great harvest.
 - D. He has granted the most praiseworthy gift, faith growing in the hearts of the Christians of this congregation and throughout the world.
 - E. He has granted the visible demonstration of that faith and life, namely, the love of the members of this congregation, and of all Christians, for one another.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

MARK 12:41-44

The Text and the Day. — The Propers for the day stress God's help in stirring us up so that we may become ever better stewards and bring forth fruits of good works. The text is

related to the Epistle for the day inasmuch as St. Paul prays that all members of the Church may walk worthy of the Lord, being fruitful in every good work.

Notes on Meaning. — V. 41: "the treasury," the place for money to defray the expenses of Temple service. The Jews, besides paying the tithe, gave freely for the support of the Temple and its worship. V. 43: "more in than all they" — more in proportion to her means, more for her than all they had given was for them, more in God's estimation.

Preaching Pitfalls. — In connection with this text there is the danger that poverty be praised and riches denounced. God often blesses His people with temporal riches. Another danger is that the promise of reward be overstressed. A true Christian gives without any thought of reward.

Preaching Emphasis. — The motive for Christian stewardship is lacking in the text. The Gospel must be added. God gave His Son out of love for us. Christ so loved us that He gave His All for us. We should give *only* out of love for Christ and His Church.

Problem and Goal. — We should recognize the fact that it is God who has given us all that we are and all that we have. He owns; we only owe. The love of Christ should constrain us to give liberally, cheerfully, and proportionately.

Outline:

GIVING IS AN ACT OF WORSHIP

- I. God wills it.
 - A. Christ sits at the treasury.
 - B. The Old Testament worship included it.
 - C. St. Paul teaches it.
- II. The Christian heart dictates it.
 - A. It is a heart of faith, love, and gratitude.
 - B. It is eager to do God's will.
 - C. It performs God's will cheerfully.
- III. Our hands perform it.
 - A. God fills our hands according to His will.
 - B. Our hands give according to His will.

ROBERT G. HEYNE

TWENTY-FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

MATT. 19:27-30

The Text and the Day. — The church year is tapering off to its close; one more Sunday after this one. So the text, taken from the closing months of Christ's public ministry, has a note of retrospect: "We have forsaken all." The Propers for the day, however, stress what must be the dominant thought in such Christian reminiscing: prayer for mercy and trust in the Lord.

Notes on Meaning. — "Then" — the story is closely related to the context. The rich young ruler had revealed himself as loving his wealth above all. The conversation about a rich man being saved, vv. 23-25, seemed to condemn a whole class, v. 24. By contrast, "we" are different, an altogether different class. Perhaps "Thou shalt have treasure in heaven," v. 21, was the word that lingered in Peter's mind.

The parallel accounts have a few important additional touches. Both Mark and Luke state that specific blessings, such as "houses, brethren, lands" are blessings "in this time." The "hundredfold" of Matthew therefore refers to the time here on earth. Luke defines Matthew's "hundredfold" as "more than anyone has ever sacrificed for the Kingdom of God's sake."

V. 28 refers to blessings reserved for the Twelve. "Regeneration" is the time of Judgment Day. The Twelve shall have special distinctions at the time of Christ's return.

V. 30: The "first" are those within the Kingdom; the "last" are those outside the Kingdom.

Preaching Pitfalls. — The text does not argue any saving qualities for poverty and form of self-denial. Neither does it present the *motive* for following Christ. Note "inherit," not "earn," eternal life. The scope of the text is rather an evaluation by comparison: Is a loss of some material benefits for the sake of Christ really a loss? Is there no compensatory gain?

The text should not be treated as referring only to blessings beyond the grave; it definitely speaks also of compensations in this life.

Problem and Goal. — The aim is to give the Christian the proper sense of values in the face of certain losses or sacrifices that he makes for the sake of Christ. Never should

the Christian believe that by such sacrifices he establishes a legitimate *claim* on blessings or rewards. Note v. 30 in this connection. But the Christian should be aware of the compensation which the Lord gives in this life and steadfastly look to the future life which is promised to him. This will give him the proper viewpoint from which to judge all matters that enter his life.

Outline:

LOSSES THAT ARE GAINS

I. The Losses.

- A. Such losses are losses for Christ's sake.
- B. Such losses may come to the Christian in many ways.

II. The Gains.

- A. What gains are promised.
- B. The purpose of such promises of gain.

H. O. A. KEINATH

TWENTY-SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

MATT. 25:1-13

The Text and the Day. — Found only in Matthew. — The last Sunday of the church year should induce us to learn the true wisdom of preparing in time for eternity, so that we may be ready at any moment to leave this world at Christ's beck and call and join Him in the heavenly mansions. Mindful of the end of all things, we should stir up ourselves to holiness of living here; and looking beyond, we should set our affections on things above.

Notes on Meaning. — The parable is addressed to people in the Church. The parable sets forth the necessity of having and retaining grace unto the very end. The leading idea is the readiness of the Church for the coming of the Lord. This is not a preparation for some millennium. The preparation is internal, not external.

Preaching Pitfalls. — Laying the emphasis on external Christianity (Baptism, confession, churchgoing, partaking of Holy Communion). Laying emphasis on the number "five." Applying the parable to the Church as "wise" and to the world as "foolish." The merchants of whom the foolish virgins

were told to buy oil may sometimes be identified with the pastors; better not to make this point. Another pitfall is laying more emphasis upon the lamps than on the oil. Remember the foolish virgins also had lamps, but failed to supply themselves with oil.

Preaching Emphasis. — If the years of God's grace before the Deluge were definitely fixed at 120, we have every reason to believe that the years of grace for the world of our days are also fixed, not only for this world at large, but for every individual soul. The oil of God's grace enables the soul to meet the Bridegroom joyfully, without dismay. The decisive test is not the lamp, but the oil in the lamp. The chief point of the parable is to be found in the supply of oil which the wise virgins had in sufficient quantity, but the foolish lacked. The Lord stresses the importance of faith, without which no man can be saved. For a while perhaps the foolish virgins had some oil, but they neglected to replenish this at the proper source and at the proper time. In the time of testing they have no light, no evidence of love, no hymns of praise, to welcome the Lord in His coming.

Problem and Goal. — We should not be content with a small measure of faith. The "wise" maintained the supply of grace by constant recourse to the means of grace. The "foolish" were satisfied with their spiritual state once and for all and took no pains to keep their spiritual life healthful and active by renewal of the Holy Spirit in their hearts. The sin of appearance without reality.

Outline:

UNTIRING PREPAREDNESS

- I. Faith allows no neutrality, stalling, and procrastination in matters of the soul.
 - A. In some things men may be different.
 1. Science.
 2. Politics.
 3. Economics.
 - B. In matters of the soul no man dare be indifferent.
 1. The divine claims upon the individual are urgent.
 2. The human claims upon the individual are urgent (brother's keeper).

3. The personal claims upon the individual are urgent (live with our conscience).

II. Unbelief paralyzes Christian vitality.

A. The world appeals to our flesh.

1. This gives us the disposition to slumber when we should be awake, alert.
2. The wise have the oil of faith to counteract their natural disposition.

B. The foolish sleep without oil in their vessels.

1. They took lamps but made no provision to keep them burning.
2. They were satisfied with a small measure of faith.
3. They foolishly believed that "it is never too late."

III. The true condition revealed in the hour of judgment.

A. There is an hour of judgment.

1. Behold, the bridegroom.
2. Behold, the bridegroom cometh.

B. There was a cry made.

1. It was made at an unexpected hour—"midnight."
2. It was an awakening cry—"all slumbered and slept."
3. It was a separating cry—"come ye forth."
4. It was a self-searching cry—"they arose and trimmed their lamps."

C. There was a crisis reached.

1. The security of the prepared. "They were ready—went in."
2. The refuges of folly—"they go to the wise; they go to the merchants."
3. The doom of the unprepared. The door was shut.

IV. The warning—Be ye ready!

A. The moral—watch.

B. Watch—because the time is uncertain.

C. Watch—because the event is sure.

EDWIN E. PIEFLOW

Miscellanea

A Program of Biblical Research

By W. F. BECK

About two million dollars were raised for our Centennial offering. Of this sum, \$213,000 are allotted to research. This fund opens thrilling possibilities to us. At last we can undertake what we have longed and prayed for.

Our first task is the study of the Bible. God wants us to meditate in His Word day and night (Joshua 1:8). Our Savior tells us to teach all He has commanded us (Matt. 28:18-20). God's Word is the life of the Church (John 6:63). God's Word is the only help for a world on the verge of suicide.

The study of His Word is the parent of other, subsidiary studies. If the Church will do its first job right, if it will institute a program for an intense study of the Bible, research in psychology and sociology will follow, and then these will be based on God's truth. Without Biblical research these other studies are confused and meaningless; they cannot stand by themselves. Valuable as they are for the time being, they are transient; they pass away like the grass and the flower in the field; students quickly assure you that research in social studies must be done over again every ten years to be valid. But the Word has in it its Author's mark of eternity. "The Word of the Lord endureth forever" (1 Pet. 1:25).

There is in our circles a widespread and heavy protest against the "dead orthodoxy" of scholarship. That protest may be sound. Even Christian scholars sometimes submerge themselves in cloistral activities and let fellow Christians and the world pass by unhelped. A good research student has a variety of characteristics: He is eager for all the facts; he is thorough; he has a sharp vision. But none of these characteristics makes research good or bad. By its fruit we know whether a piece of research is good or bad. That research is bad which helps no one. That research is good which helps people. Only that research can be called Christian which serves humanity. And in the face of an atomic destruction of civilization and of an imminent wiping-out of all learned works, God would have us make our scholarship as immediately effective as possible. — Everything suggested in this program of Biblical research is geared to be as thorough and as helpful as possible.

There is another reason why the program of research must be effective. The financing of our research is critical. If the \$213,000 are spent for the benefit of a few people, if we fail to serve the Church with them in a heart-warming way, there will not be another sum like this; our Christian people will exercise their right to refuse to grant any more money—and that would be tragic: The program outlined here shows that Biblical research alone will be severely limited by \$213,000. It is our inescapable

responsibility to use every dollar in such a way that it will, intensively and extensively, do the most good; we must study with such an impact of usefulness to pastors and people that they will be eager to continue the flow of money for research.

We Have the Manpower

Some of our manpower is going to waste because we have not stimulated it, guided it, or offered to publish worth-while studies.

1. We must reach beyond our busy professors and get the co-operation of the Hebrew and Greek students that are scattered throughout our Church.

2. A large number of highly trained students at the Seminary are available.

The St. Louis Seminary is not strictly a graduate school, and many a student needs training and maturity to do careful research. But the number of men at our Seminary who are working for the master's and doctor's degree is multiplying fast, and their work is improving from year to year. A program of Biblical research is the best thing that can happen to these students. It will guide them into the right kind of purposive study of the Scriptures, secure from them solid contributions to our Biblical materials, make them wherever they go the bearers of the exegetical life of their Church, and consequently direct our whole clergy, as it builds the Church, into the sound ways of Biblical thinking.

It would be best to put two full-time men in charge, one for the Old Testament and another for the New Testament. Present members of the exegetical department of our faculty confess they are too overloaded to take on much more work. We must be extremely cautious in appointing a man. This is not a job. This is a task for a man of God gifted with a special zeal for the study of God's Word.

Projects of Biblical Research

The projects of Biblical research may be listed in the order of their importance as follows:

1. A Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament.

This dictionary would be based on Bauer and Kittel. "Our need is something on the scale of the full Preuschen-Bauer, with its indications of extra-N. T. usage including that of the Apostolic Fathers and its wealth of references. As I told you in our conversation the other day, the need for an adequate N. T. dictionary, grammar, and concordance is acute and immediate, and should receive priority. And the greatest of these is the dictionary." (Professor M. Franzmann in a letter, June 7, 1948.)

It will take a separate article to show how we are realizing that the Septuagint with its Hebrew background has had a greater influence than the classical usage recorded in Liddell and Scott in determining the meaning of the New Testament. This influence of the LXX has not been given full weight in the dictionaries of

the New Testament. There is no other way out: We shall have to construct a dictionary of the LXX. The printing of this LXX dictionary may await the special contribution of a philanthropist, but the material is essential and should be available for a New Testament dictionary.

Meanwhile we need a pocket dictionary immediately to tide pastors and students over the years that it will take to produce the major work. This pocket volume would be modeled after the *Taschenwoerterbuch* of E. Preuschen of 1937. This, too, is a necessity in every Christian pastor's library and would be permanently useful.

2. An English Aramaic Grammar

The old German grammars by Marti, Strack, and others cannot be had anywhere. There is no such thing in English. We inquired at the Oriental Institute in Chicago, and we can find no one definitely interested in producing this Aramaic grammar. If we do nothing about this, the Aramaic sections (Ezra 4:8—6:18; 7:12-26; Jer. 10:11; Daniel 2:4 b—7:28) and the Aramaic forms in other parts of the Bible must remain blind spots to some of our best students. It is now almost impossible to study an Aramaic form. The very few students who venture into the unknown must individually construct their own grammar for the Aramaic materials. Yet the Aramaic parts of the Old Testament are a part of the council of God entrusted to us, and we are to study and to teach them.

3. The Organization of Archaeological Materials

The enormous resources of archaeology are waiting to be evaluated and used in the interpretation of the Bible. Good exegesis cannot do without it. Dr. Heidel, who for the past decade has worked on the cuneiform texts having a bearing on the Old Testament, and Dr. Brustat have shown us how helpful archaeology can be.

The best volumes on archaeology that are available today seem to have been thrown together with little concern for the active ministry. It is impossible to get anything readily useful out of them. The index, for example, in Finegan's *Light from the Ancient Past* is a real disappointment. From my own experience with these volumes I am ready to say it is not a pastor's fault if he knows little about archaeology. These materials can well be constructed in such a way that they will stand like porters ready to serve.

Significant archaeological objects should be bought and made available to students. Others should be reconstructed. One research student could be sent out to photograph in color the precious things that are misrepresented in gray and black by poorly printed pictures in books. Another could be busy for a long period, covering the country, perhaps the world, to describe, classify, and catalog the kind and location of objects. All this will require careful filing.

Then there is the task of listing all the archaeological materials that have a bearing on any Biblical text and of making them readily available for exegesis.

4. The Reconstruction of the Original Text

At a conference we spent a long time discussing a doctrinal difficulty in a passage only to notice at the end that the best manuscripts omit that passage.

We need the best possible text for an independent, well-grounded conviction. Without it our preaching has a weakness. Without it we'll sooner or later stand dumbfounded before a modernistic scholar who denies the historicity of a phrase that we use as proof. At present a pastor can only with great difficulty decide what the best text is. His texts and commentaries do not supply a layout of the full evidence.

Students of the Greek New Testament are aware of the shortcomings of the present texts. Tischendorf preferred Aleph; Westcott and Hort, and Weiss preferred B; and Nestle handicapped himself by adopting the "resultant" text, which is essentially Egyptian, and by letting a mechanical principle influence him to place other valuable readings into the apparatus. To get the ideal text, each reader during his reading has to discover the worthy elements in the apparatus and revise the text accordingly. Nestle's apparatus also leaves too much to implication; sometimes the evidence which is omitted changes the verdict in regard to the correct text.

We need —

a. A large text edition

By another judicious evaluation of each word in the manuscripts we must construct the best possible text. This edition should show the whole evidence, the quoted comment of the church fathers and interpreters, and the line of reasoning for future reference, checking, and improvement. The apparatus, unlike that of Nestle, should list the manuscripts according to localities or groups (compare B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, Macmillan Co., N. Y., 1925).

b. A pocket edition of the text

The apparatus of the pocket edition would be a condensation of the apparatus in the large edition.

c. A volume on textual criticism

- (1) A historical evaluation of each manuscript
- (2) The organization of evidence for families of manuscripts
- (3) A new statement of the principles of textual criticism in the light of this material
- (4) The construction of tables for quick references and manipulation

The new Isaiah manuscript, which probably comes from the second century before Christ, will start a new program of Old Testament textual studies. We must be in the forefront of that.

5. A Chronological Harmony of the Whole Bible

The setting in which God gave His Word is the very best for reading it. If you have never read the Old Testament chronologically, the Prophets with the kings under whom they lived, Lamentations with the fall of Jerusalem, Paul's Letters with his travels, there is a new delight in store for you. All our theologians, teachers, and lay people are entitled to that delight.

a. In Hebrew and Greek

To see the text of the Prophets in the light of the record of contemporary history, and on the other hand to listen to the prophetic pronouncements as you study a historical event is the best exegesis. This is Scripture interpreting itself. (Most of the basic work for this chronological harmony of the whole Bible has now been done; the verse-by-verse harmony of the Old Testament by references alone takes up thirty-four single-spaced typewriter pages; if the money is available, we can soon proceed to printing.)

b. In English

This is a family Bible. Christian people are reading a multitude of interesting things. But most Christians are not living in the Bible. Whose fault is it? It is not the fault of the Bible; the Bible has the most delightful stories and the most appealing messages in the world. It is not altogether the fault of Christian people. Many of them are trying hard to interest themselves in the religious things we give them. But the present form in which our Bibles are printed is admitted to be about the dullest possible. It is up to us to put the Bible — where it once was when God gave it — into the life of the people; it is up to us to create the materials that will make everyone, child and adult, aware of the fact that the Bible is the most beautiful, interesting, and helpful book in life.

6. Systematic Exegesis of the Whole Bible

(Practically this project would come earlier in the order, but numbers 1—5 are prerequisite for exegesis.)

The lack of solid textual studies handicaps us in every corner of our church life. A large number of our pastors would immediately live exegetically in their sermon making if that were possible. For years I have worked with six (or more) of the best New Testament commentaries, four different grammars, and three different lexica. Most pastors have at best only one of the commentaries. As we search for the clear meaning of a word in its setting, we are quickly convinced of the inadequacy of any one of the commentaries to give that cumulative critical judgment which today is possible in regard to the meaning of a text. Our pastors are forced to labor individualistically with one commentary, and when they discover errors and the inadequacy of their material, there is no available corrective. (It is painful even to mention the Old Testament; there is almost no help at all available for its difficult passages.) And yet in most cases the basis for an understanding of the textual

meaning is nothing profuse at all, but just a simple reasoning from all the facts in hand. Many a pastor would give almost anything to be able to lay his hand readily on all the evidence pertaining to a text. He should be given what he needs. The task is immense, but in God's name it can be done.

This material may be highly flexible to adapt itself to all the needs of pastors. It would include —

- a. A critical study of the text
- b. A clear-cut interpretation of the text
- c. Special studies of difficult subjects
- d. Reprints of the best materials from other sources
- e. Illustrations of archaeological objects and of localities, diagrams, and any pictorial designs that would clarify or enrich the meaning of the text
- f. Illustrative materials from the life of today

A sound Lutheran exegesis is the greatest need of theologians all over the world.

7. A parallel Hebrew-Greek Old Testament.

Kittel's Hebrew Old Testament and Rahlfs's Septuagint have reached such perfection that a combination of the two can now be printed. It would be the *Polyglottenbibel* brought up to date, but it would omit the Latin and the German columns. This would be a vital help to Biblical scholarship.

8. A Hebrew-English Dictionary of the Old Testament (?)

Since the last Hebrew-English dictionary of Gesenius was put out in 1906 by Brown, Driver, and Briggs, the German revision by Buhl has gone through three later editions, the latest in 1921 (the 1921 edition is the same as the 1916 edition; the 1916 edition has better paper). The Vatican has been busy producing a Hebrew-Latin dictionary: *Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum Veteris Testamenti*. Editor: Franciscus Zorell, S. J. Roma: Sumptibus Pontifici Instituti Biblici, 1947. The first 560 pages of this work may be seen in the Chicago Divinity Library. Another, a Hebrew-German-English dictionary, is being prepared in Leiden, Holland; it breaks from the Gesenius-Buhl pattern. These efforts may make a production of our own unnecessary. Our students do need a dictionary that is freed from the conjectures of higher criticism.

A massive attack according to this program of Biblical research will —

Stimulate Bible studies, such as we have not seen before, at conferences and in our congregations;

Do more than any other equivalent investment of funds for the preservation of the truth and of a sound fellowship among Lutherans;

Enable us to be worthy successors of the Biblical scholars of the centuries as we, instead of passively reproducing the past, actively and creatively live in the Word for the needs of today;

Create an aggressive Church that will mightily convince the world, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus is its Christ.

St. Louis, Mo.

Progress in Race Relations

While we have no political ax to grind, we are deeply interested in the various angles of the race question that have to do with the moral and religious field. On account of the numerous colored congregations which are connected with our Synodical Conference, an editorial in *America* (July 31) which has the heading "Negro Voters in the South" is of interest to readers of this journal. We reprint it here without comment.

"While the demagogues rage and the politicians meditate vain things, steady, if unobtrusive, progress is being made toward winning complete freedom of the franchise for Negroes in the South. The number of qualified Negro voters in the Southern States has tripled since 1940, reports the Southern Regional Conference; and it is highly probable that any of the ground gained will be lost. Outside of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama the picture is distinctly encouraging. In most of the larger cities of Texas, Oklahoma, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Virginia, Negroes are able to run for election to city councils, school boards, etc., without incurring any hostility or reprisals. Kentucky has a Negro in the State legislature, and Richmond, Va., one on the city council. 'It would be difficult,' says the Southern Regional Council's report, 'to point to more than a handful of Southern cities with a population of more than 25,000 where there is vigorous opposition to Negroes becoming registered voters.' Opposition is strongest in the rural districts, where sixty-five per cent of the Southern Negroes live. While seven States retain the poll tax, it is found to be a significant barrier to voting only in Mississippi, Virginia, and Alabama. Perhaps informed opinion in the South is coming to appreciate the fact that arbitrary restriction of the right of suffrage is a short cut to bad government."

A.

Lexical Notes on the "Kingdom"

By R. T. DU BRAU

Greek grammarians generally agree that the influence of Christianity upon the Greek thesaurus of words is not grammatical, but chiefly lexical. To begin with, the vocabulary of the Greek New Testament is somewhat limited, just about 5,600 words, including proper names. This number is quite sufficient, however. The average American is said to have a fairly extensive vocabulary if he uses 5,000 words. The Englishman can get along with 4,000,

his idiom being less enriched by extraneous contributions than that of the American. Thus the Authorized Version of both the Old and the New Testament employs but 6,000 words.

Christianity has given distinctive ideas to Greek words already in popular use, like βασιλεία, κοινωνία, and many others. "Though Greek words were used, they were the symbols of quite other than Greek ideas" (Smith, *Bible Dictionary*). And these new connotations of common Greek words in the New Testament will prove that "in the history of these and such like words lies the history of Christianity" (see Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*). This is particularly true where distinctively Christian ideas are given. As Robertson rightly observes, the new message glorified the current κοινή, took the words from the street and made them bear a new content. By way of analogy compare Luther's translation into the language of the *uomo qualunque*, the common man, whose speech was vastly different from that of the learned and the priesthood of his day. Modern French provides a striking parallel, for the religious vocabulary of French Protestantism differs considerably from the Roman Catholic usage of the Church of Gaul. When we realize that at the dawn of the Christian Church terms like βασιλεία were used in the popular language of the day, then the new message of the Gospel becomes to us all the more pointed and to the point.

Classical Usage

The Ionic form was βασιλήϊη. Ancient schoolboys knew this well enough. There are not a few collections of ancient Greek schoolbooks, copybooks, or their equivalents (wax tablets, ostraca, papyri) in existence (cp. Jouget-Lefebvre, *Deux Ostraka de Thebes*, etc.). The Berlin Papyrus No. 5014 is a fine example. The student is explaining and paraphrasing Homeric expressions into the Greek of his own day in opposite columns, e. g.: Ἀχιλλῆος = τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως; τὰ πρῶτα = τὴν ἀρχήν; and, of interest to us here: βασιλῆϊ = τῷ βασιλεῖ.

But one need reach no farther into antiquity than Xenophon, in whose writings the whole concept is given with much clarity, e. g.: "βασιλείαν δὲ καὶ τυραννίδα ἀρχὰς μὲν ἀμφοτέρως ἡγεῖτο εἶναι, διαφέρειν δὲ ἀλλήλων ἐνόμιζε; somewhat later, . . . καὶ κατὰ νόμους τῶν πόλεων βασιλείαν ἡγεῖτο" (*Memorabilia* 4:6.12).

In English, βασιλεία is covered by an impressive line of synonyms and related words, such as "kingdom," "royal realm," "royal dominion," "kingship," "royal rule," "reign," "sovereignty," "authority," even "royal dignity and power" (regnum, regia potestas, regia dignitas). It is a designation of both the power and the form of a king's government, and with later writers it includes the territory of the royal rule. The word has remained βασιλεία in modern Greek. Here, then, was a made-to-order term for Christianity to apply to the reign of their own King of Kings, to the rule of God in the world and in the hearts of men; past, present, and future.

The Ancient Word for the New Testament

βασιλεία occurs 157 times in the New Testament. It is used 13 times in the profane sense of realm or kingdom, and 24 times in a general religious sense of divine rule or kingdom. The numerous remaining occurrences are modified by the noteworthy additions "of God," "of heaven," "of the Father," and "of Christ." This variegated usage of βασιλεία in the New Testament is most remarkable. Bengel (*Gnomon*) remarks: "it is an example of the elegance in the divine style that first in the abstract the *Kingdom* should be said to have come, then in the concrete the *King* or Messiah. The former mode of expression accords with the secrecy of the foundations, the latter with the glorification."

The Apocalypse is particularly rich in examples of the manifold use of the word. As a designation of *power* we find it in Rev. 12:10: "Now is come salvation, and strength, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, and the power of His Christ." In 17:18 A. V. translates ἔχουσα βασιλείαν with "reigneth." The profane sense of royal power and dignity is evident from 17:17, where God will "give their βασιλείαν unto the beast." There is a wide range of application; in 1:9 the inspired author of the Apocalypse calls himself a συγκοινωνὸς in tribulation, καὶ βασιλείᾳ and patience of Jesus. In the prophetic passages 16:10: "his kingdom was full of darkness," and 11:15: "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord," the term can be explained as "dominion over the world." So in Revelation βασιλεία always denotes *royal power* and *royal glory*. In this same sense it occurs also in 1 Cor. 15:24, and in Luke 1:33, βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. In other passages βασιλεία describes the *realm*, the *Kingdom*, as the *sphere of rule*, e. g., Matt. 12:25 ff., Mark 6:23, Luke 19:12 ff., Acts 1:6, and many others.

The Kingdom of Heaven

This is St. Matthew's own *usus loquendi*. He employs the phrase 32 times, while he uses "Kingdom of God" four times. Ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is not sufficiently confirmed in John 3:5 (the Sinaiticus has it *prima manu*, and it occurs in a very few unimportant fragments. Among the Fathers, Justinian II and Origen thus quote the passage). In 2 Tim. 4:18 we have τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον.

In accord with the aim of the first synoptic Gospel βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν has a specific Old Testament basis. The use of *heaven* in its plural sense is a Semitic manner of speaking. It could well be called a Messianic term, for our Lord Himself seems to prefer the familiar *kingdom of heaven*. That the metonymy *heaven* for *God* was popularly used and understood is clearly shown by Matt. 21:25 ("was it from heaven or men?") and its parallels Mark 11:30, Luke 20:4; likewise in Luke 15:18, 21 ("sinned against heaven").

The βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is the divine, spiritual kingdom, even the reign of Messiah in the world, in the individual, and the Kingdom of Glory. The υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας were its erstwhile possessors,

the Jews, Matt. 8:12; while in Matt. 13:38 *et al* they are all true believers.

Bengel refers to *the kingdom of the heavens* as the Kingdom of God, for so it is called also by Matthew sometimes as his book proceeds, and always in the other books of the New Testament, as in Acts 1:3; 28:31; and Rom. 14:17. The metonymy by which *Heaven* is substituted for *God* is of frequent occurrence, and very suitable to the first times of the Gospel; he adds: "*Regni coelorum appellatione, libris N. T. fere propria, praecidebatur spes regni terreni, et invitabantur omnes ad coelestia.*" To him the future belongs to the Kingdom of God as the kingdom of the heavens ("*sic appellatur cum prospectu ad consummationem*") Luke 21:31.

The Kingdom of God

As mentioned before, Matthew uses ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ four or five times. In the remainder of the New Testament the phrase occurs 64 times more. Mark and Luke always have it thus, and Paul, whenever he speaks of the Christian hope and the eternal goal of all believers, says *Kingdom of God*.

This designation is not as Semitic as the previous *kingdom of heaven*, a fact that furnishes additional light upon the interesting usage of these terms in the Scripture. Hellenistic Christendom divested itself more and more of the Jewish vocabulary and preferred to say "Kingdom of God." It was therefore no accident that St. Augustine called his book *De Civitate Dei*; just as our modern enthusiasm for world-wide missions is derived from the prayer "Thy kingdom come."

Further modes of expressing the same idea are βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς six times; and "His kingdom," i. e., the kingdom of Christ, 15 times. Here it points to the economy of God's grace in Christ. Head and heart of the βασιλεία τοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ (Eph. 5:5) is Jesus the Christ, and with Him the believers united in the *una sancta*.

The usages in the apocryphal writings never fail to be of interest. Migne in his monumental *Patrologia* (165 volumes in the Parisian Greek-Latin edition!) quotes a portion of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews": τοὺς ἀξίους τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλείας (XXIV, 668).

In the *Didache* of the Twelve Apostles, IX, we read about the "gathering of His church (ἐκκλησία) from the ends of the earth εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν." This reading is from a text of the Patriarchal Library in Jerusalem, dated 1056 A. D.

II Clement 12:2 adduces: πότε ἤξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία.

The Patrological Use

Hippolytus (died 230), in his celebrated *Commentary on Daniel*, speaks of the ἀγίων βασιλείας; quoted in full in *Agraphon* No. 25 b, in the Klostermann collection, Bonn 1911.

Few textual studies are considered complete without com-

paring the use of certain words by Origen. His homilies are of surpassing interest with regard to his quotations from the Scriptures. In his sermon on Jer. 11 (In Ieremiam homilia octava) we read in the Greek of the Codex Scorialensis: ὡς καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ γέγονεν ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τὸ . . . here follows a literal quotation of Matt. 21:43. Jerome's translation of Origen's homilies simply has *regnum* for βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ("et factum est de regno id quod novimus praedictum:" Matt. 21:43), which would indicate that in his day the word "regnum" in church Latin meant "regnum Dei."

Eustathius of Antioch, who was Bishop of Berea in 320, even speaks of τῆς αἰδίου βασιλείας. This occurs in his reply or apology to Origen's Homily "'Εἰς τὴν τῶν βασιλείων Α'." In this text Eustathius often speaks of the reign of the kings of Judah as ἡ βασιλεία. (Cod. Monacensis graecus 331, saec. X.)

But βασιλεία retains its classical use throughout the centuries. Rewarding in this respect is a study of the various reports and legends built upon the Visio Constantini at the Pons Mulvius ("ἐν τούτῳ νίκα"). So Eusebius in his Ecclesiasticae Historiae, Liber VIII (last emendation of 325 A. D.), writes: ὁ καὶ τιμῇ καὶ τάξει τῆς βασιλείας πρῶτος Κωνσταντῖνος, "Constantine who became first in royal dignity and position." In Eusebius' *Vita Constantini*, I, 40, one reads: τῆς καθόλου βασιλείας. For the sake of completeness we should quote, perhaps, also a passage from the cod. Athous Laura in the Vatican (8th century), from certain Anonymi Visio Constantini: The manuscript opens with 'Ἐν ἔτει ἐβδόμῳ τῆς βασιλείας Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως.

"Kingdom" in the Papyri

In view of the great wealth of available material βασιλεία is rarer than one would expect in the papyri. Instead of "in the reign of . . ." one more often finds "in the year of. . ." There is, first of all, P. Oxyr. 1, that epochal, apocryphal collection of Logia Jesu, written, as far as can be ascertained, before 140 A. D. where Jesus is quoted as saying οὐ μὴ εὕρηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. The whole idea is: "Except ye fast to the world, ye shall in no wise find the Kingdom of God."

The "New Sayings of Jesus," P. Oxyr. 654, written before 300 A. D., has the phrase ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστίν (line 11).

A fascinating interview of one Appianus with Marcus Aurelius (or perhaps Verus), late second century, brings the use of βασιλεία as the realm or territory of a queen (Cleopatra): πρῶτον μὲν Καίσαρ ἔσωσε Κλεοπάτραν, ἐκράτησεν βασιλείας; P. Oxyr., 33, V.

By the year 303 A. D. βασιλεία had been reduced to the meaning of a mere reign, whether the ruler was a king or less. Thus, one Aurelius Demetrius in a civil complaint refers to the "auspicious reign of the gymnasiarch," the prefect of his νομή: τῆς εὐδέμονος [sic.] ταύτης βασιλείας. . . . P. Oxyr., 71.

We have an Imperial Edict published by Severus Alexander

concerning the *aurum coronarium* for the whole empire (late third century), wherein with much self-flattery he refers to the "proper and moderate administration" of his empire: τῆς βασιλείας διοικοῦντα. P. Fayum, 20.

Finally, throughout the sixth century the phrase "in the year of the reign of our most godly and pious sovereign Flavius Justinian, eternal Augustus and Imperator," becomes very common, and the numerous documents written in Justinian's reign begin with βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου δεσπότου, etc. P. Oxyr., 125, 126, 133—137, et al.

These and many other examples of papyrological usage entitle us to observe and conclude that the word for any sort of "reign" or "rule", whether it be that of emperor, king, or mere prefect, consul, or burgomaster, can always be βασιλεία. Here our modern languages make a finer distinction when they speak of the reign of kings, the government, or administration, of public officials.

Theologico-Critical Summary

In the theological sense the *Kingdom* is the Kingdom of God, also called the kingdom of heaven, the kingdom of the Father and of Christ, His only-begotten Son, in whom the Father is manifest. It exists wherever and whenever there are believers. Externally and visibly we see it in the typical beginnings of Old Testament revelation to the children of Israel. What the term presupposes is easily seen from prophecies like Is. 2:11; Micah 4; Jer. 23; Ezek. 34; Dan. 2, as well as from Psalms 93—99. These promises of the Kingdom are rooted in the relation of God to Israel, a relation by which God manifests His royal authority and dominion in Israel by saving and redeeming; among the Gentiles, as the foes of faith, by judgments.

As to this Old Testament basis, βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ being a new order of things, it owes its character to the realization of God's rule among His children, and thus it becomes the comprehensive New Testament expression for the object promised and expected in the divine plan of salvation. In our own terminology we speak of Christ's far-extending Kingdom of Grace, which in its perfect state becomes the Kingdom of Glory. The New Testament speaks of God's kingdom as a kingdom now present, as well as one to come. So Matt. 5:20: "Except your righteousness shall exceed . . . ye shall enter in no case into the kingdom of heaven," corresponds to the σωθῆναι in Mark 10:26 and to the ζῶν αἰώνιον in Mark 10:17. There is an intimate connection between the σωτηρία or the ζῶν αἰώνιος and the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

Because the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is the fulfillment of the saving purposes of God as proclaimed by the Prophets, we understand why the preaching of the Gospel began with the announcement πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, Mark 1:15, Luke 10:9-11. To which announcement the Christian says: "Amen!" "Thy kingdom come!" Matt. 6:10 and Luke 11:2. Here also lies

the explanation for the emphasis on the distinction between the redemptive economy of the Old and New Testaments: Matt. 11: 11 and Luke 7: 28.

Therefore the Kingdom of God forms the contents and subject of evangelical preaching and teaching, "disputing and persuading the things concerning the Kingdom of God," Acts 19: 8 and 28: 23.

The Kingdom and the Cosmos

The κόσμος as opposed to the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, has the article in Greek. It is used without it in such phrases as καταβολῆς κόσμου, κτίσεως κόσμου; in 2 Cor. 5: 19. It is used without the article where it signifies the whole creation as participating in the reconciliation to God brought about by Christ (cp. Rom. 8: 21). In 2 Pet. 2: 5 ἀρχαῖον κόσμον is the physical world, and in Rom. 11: 12-15 it is used to denote the Gentile world as opposed to the βασιλεία, the sphere of God's reign, or that order of things in which the prevalence of His will, especially His saving will of grace, becomes revealed. Luke 16: 16, ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται. Cp. furthermore Luke 17: 20, "the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation."

When Christ therefore says, John 18: 36: ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, He shows that the present order of things (κόσμος) does not set forth the glory of God. The Apostles express and emphasize the antagonism between it and this world, 1 Cor. 15: 50: σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύναται.

The Church and the Kingdom

The Kingdom of God as the salvation of Israel and the redemption that is in Christ Jesus is both the possession and the hope of the ἐκκλησία, Luke 12: 32: ". . . it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom"; Heb. 12: 28: ". . . we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved." The Kingdom is related to the ἐκκλησία as redemption is related to the Church of the believers. The church is the sphere wherein the marks of the Kingdom are demonstrated and manifest. In no wise, however, does the Church become the form or embodiment of the Kingdom, for "the Kingdom of God is within you."

As we have seen, the history and study of the Greek vocabulary dealing with the subject, and the language and acts of our Lord, best explain the nature of the Kingdom. It is not the counterpart of the empire. For here, in the Kingdom of God, a communion has been opened between this visible and the invisible world. The Apostles dwell on the great events of death and resurrection as evidences that Jesus was the King and His kingdom spiritual. The foundation of the Kingdom was the union of God with man; herein are contained the doctrines of reconciliation, of justification by faith, and of sanctification by the Holy Ghost.

Church history is to some extent the history of the various opinions which grew up concerning the nature of this kingdom.

The growth of the Papacy was the growth of the idea that the visible Church was modeled after the fashion of the empire of the Caesars, with a visible head as Christ's representative. A visit to Rome, spending enough time among the monuments of the Forum Romanum and in the Vatican, strongly confirms this observation.

The Reformation broke with the idea of a visible, authoritarian, and totalitarian kingdom, with a visible lordship over individual souls. "The Kingdom of God is among you," said the Savior, and the Apostles spoke of it as set up in the world, indeed, but as fighting against the world. It is among us and is opposed to the spirit of the world. Whereas the spirit of the world is selfishness, the spirit of Christ is self-sacrifice and self-denial. Whereas the spirit of the world is sin and death, the spirit of the King of Kings is life and salvation.

Against all that is false and sinful and unholy in the world the Spirit of Christ is at war. The Kingdom, then, is spiritual in character, and no carnal weapons may be used in its establishment and propagation, just as no weapon that is forged against it shall prosper.

The kingdom of God is the whole spiritual communion of all believers. While these live and work in the visible Church, the Kingdom nevertheless is more comprehensive and greater and more catholic than the visible Church in any age or all ages.



Theological Observer

The Eisenach Decisions.—Two important meetings were held in Eisenach, Germany, during the first part of July. The purpose of the first was to solidify the Lutherans, and of the second to unite all Protestants of Germany. The two meetings may be viewed as the culmination of two trends in German theology. A little more than a century ago a unionistic wave swept over the German churches. Almost simultaneously a revival of Lutheran consciousness gained momentum in certain areas, and a strong desire to unite all Lutherans in a *corpus Lutheranorum* manifested itself. However, in the course of the century, the trend toward a union of Lutherans, Reformed, and Evangelicals gained the upper hand.

To understand the subsequent history, it is necessary to keep in mind that basic changes have occurred in the German churches during the last thirty years. Strictly speaking, the term "State Church" is a misnomer; there are no State Churches, unless one would speak of State Churches where the government supervises religious instruction in the schools and trains the pastors at the state universities, and in some instances serves as a collecting agency—for a consideration—to collect the church taxes. The Churches of Germany should rather be called provincial or territorial Churches, inasmuch as the respective Churches are usually coextensive with the political territory. Two things are characteristic of the territorial Churches: first, every baptized member is a member of the Church unless he publicly severs his connection with the Church. Secondly, each territorial Church is bound by a Lutheran or Reformed or Evangelical (*uniert*) confession. After the outbreak of the church struggle in 1933 a concerted effort was made to unite the various territorial Churches for the purpose of counteracting the neopagan philosophy of Hitler and Rosenberg. However, serious tensions among the German theologians, and especially the outbreak of the war and its concomitant events, halted all union endeavors for the time being. After the collapse in 1945 a renewed attempt was made to unite the various State Churches of Germany in one large German church known as the *Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland* (EKiD). It was urged by a large number of German theologians that the bond which in spite of divergent confessions had united the Christians from the various provincial Churches in their common opposition to Hitler must at all odds be preserved. This unity, they claimed, demands the organization of a new united Church, comprising all territorial Churches, whether Lutheran, Reformed, or *uniert*. A number of Lutheran territorial Churches, notably Bavaria, however, were opposed to the formation of such a unionistic Church, though they agreed to the plan to organize all territorial Churches as a federation, to co-operate in all matters which would be of joint interest. These Lutherans believed that the propitious moment had come

to establish a *corpus Lutheranorum*. It can readily be understood what tremendous tensions came to the surface at Eisenach.

In the first meeting, July 6—8, nine Lutheran territorial churches were represented: Bayern, Hannover, Sachsen, Schleswig-Holstein, Thuringen, Mecklenburg, Hamburg, Braunschweig, and Schaumburg-Lippe. Representatives of Wuerttemberg, Oldenburg, Luebeck, and Pommern were also present. Unfortunately, we are not in possession of the constitution. According to the *Evangelische Pressedienst*, the theme of the convention was: True unity does not consist in organizational unity, but in the unity of proclaiming the Gospel and administering the Sacraments; for this reason churches of the same confession should be banded together and be motivated by the common willingness to perform all church work according to the Confessions of the Lutheran Church. It was also urged that unless German Protestantism is conscious of its *confessional* orientation, it will lose its influence and will miss its obligation to preach the Gospel of justification through Christ Jesus alone. It is purely conjectural whether American Lutheranism has helped to deepen this confessionalism or whether it is due to an inner spiritual struggle. As soon as three territorial Lutheran Churches have approved the constitution, the VELKD will be a reality. The charter members hope that ultimately all other Lutheran *Landeskirchen* will unite in one concerted effort to preserve the heritage of the Lutheran Reformation. The confessional bases are the Lutheran Confessions, principally the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism. Mr. Hagemann of Hannover was elected chairman of the General Synod; Bishops Meiser and Beste were elected to head the Bishops' Conference.

Immediately after this meeting representatives from all the German territorial Churches, Lutheran, Reformed, and Evangelical, met to discuss the organization of the EKID. Two important questions confronted this conference. The first question was whether the EKID is to be a Church or a federation; and the second question was whether the Lord's Supper may be administered indiscriminately among the various member churches. Many desired to effect an organic union of the three confessional groups, but the confessional Lutheran leaders were not willing to establish organic union without doctrinal agreement. The first article of the constitution now reads: "The Evangelical Church in Germany is a federation of Lutheran, Reformed, and *unierte* churches. The EKID recognizes the respective confessional basis of each member church and assumes that each will make its confession effective in doctrine, life, and organization of the church." In Article II we read: "No legal enactment of the joint Church dare violate the confession of a member church. Nor dare the legal enactment of a member church violate the right of the joint Church."

The member churches are to work conjointly in all externals which confront the German churches since the collapse, e. g., the training of the clergy, the physical welfare of the clergy, the eleemosynary work of the churches. At the same time the constituent

churches are pledged to work for a real spiritual unity. For many this is not a pious platitude nor a unionistic wish. For some of the aims and purposes adopted in the constitution go beyond that which we are wont to define as "co-operation in externals."

The question concerning joint Communion has been a bone of contention in Germany for a century and has become a burning issue since the tremendous influx of refugees into Germany and the great migration due to the housing shortage. Lutherans find themselves in Reformed territory without Lutheran pastors, and Reformed appeal to Lutheran pastors for spiritual ministrations. Altar fellowship between Lutherans and Reformed is therefore both a theological and a practical question. A relatively large number both of the *unierte* and the traditionally Lutheran *Landeskirchen* were willing to establish "open Communion." However, a minority of Lutherans held out against indiscriminate altar fellowship. After two days of debate the following paragraph (Art. IV, 4) was adopted: "Concerning the admission to Holy Communion there is no full agreement in the EKiD. In many member churches adherents of another confession are admitted without any restrictions. In no member church will a member of another confessional group recognized by the EKiD be refused the Lord's Supper where pastoral responsibility or congregational conditions demand such admission." The sentence is constructed in such a way that at first reading it is difficult to get the full meaning, but we were told that under this provision a pastor may refuse Communion to a person if he feels conscience bound to do so. This is substantiated by another paragraph (Art. IV, 1): "The member churches and the respective congregations will observe the regulations of their respective confession in the proclamation of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. Arrangements affecting altar and pulpit fellowship remain within the province of each membership."

The report as released by R.N.S. will interest our readers: "Conservative Lutheranism gained a signal victory for its doctrinal position on the sacrament of Holy Communion at the meeting here of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKiD). After four days' discussion of the issue an article was written into the new constitution of EKiD which provides for 'a common Lord's Supper upon mutual agreement.' In other words, the question of who shall commune is left to the individual Land Churches, as is the current practice. Members of the Confessing Church, led by Dr. Martin Niemöller, argued in favor of completely unrestricted mutual participation in Holy Communion. This proposal was opposed, however, by a group headed by Bishop Hans Meiser of Bavaria, president of the newly organized United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany. Bishop Meiser's group insisted that the decisions of the second Treysa Conference of the Evangelical Church in Germany, held in June of 1947, should be respected. At Treysa it was agreed that 'Evangelical Church members are not to be excluded from the Lord's Supper if they belong to another

confession than the EKID.' This agreement was made particularly to guarantee spiritual ministrations to the millions of displaced German Protestants who now reside on territory of established churches other than their own. While it would seem to provide for unrestricted participation in Holy Communion, its practical application was intended only in cases of 'dire extremity,' for example, if a church member was dying and was not able to receive the Lord's Supper from his own denomination. It was pointed out that refugees of the Reformed faith are often invited to the Lord's Supper of Lutherans, but Lutheran churchmen at the sessions were opposed to having the practice validated through a constitutional provision in EKID. Professor Paul Tillich of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, who is visiting in Germany this summer, observed that 'The Lutheran Church is developing a tendency to win power within Protestantism.' Dean Heinrich Grueber, a member of the Office of Church Affairs of the Berlin City Council, declared that 'the attitude of Lutherans indicates their confessional power.' Bishop F. Otto Dibelius of Berlin admitted that the matter of administering the Lord's Supper to Reformed refugees 'constitutes a serious problem for Lutherans.'"

The question arises whether a federation of this kind, where the denominational doctrinal differences are not removed, but recognized to exist, can live and prosper. Many a Lutheran will feel that the federation is a violation of the Scriptural principle that we Christians must be faithful to every truth that God has revealed in the Holy Scriptures. We are happy to see that the Lutheran consciousness was strong enough to prevent the establishment of a union church, in which all differences would simply be submerged and error would be granted the same rights as the truth. Another question of interest for us is whether the Eisenach decisions will ultimately interest and affect also the lower echelons, the congregations, or whether these resolutions are merely legislative enactments which become binding without the congregations' voice in the matter having been heard. May the day soon dawn upon Europe when the laity will be fully conscious of its glorious prerogatives and high responsibilities.

F. E. M.

Educating for the Ministry.— In *Christendom* (Pre-Amsterdam Number, Summer, 1948), Prof. F. C. Grant of Union Theological Seminary, under this heading, offers a number of valuable suggestions regarding the training of pastors for knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed in the modern ministry, which well deserve study by the Christian churches today. In closing his article he lists some of the current defects, the result, very largely, of inadequate high school and college education, as follows: "1. Too many students cannot spell accurately, punctuate, or use proper grammar. The same goes for vast numbers of the ordained ministers of our churches. 2. The attitude of too many of them toward the study of foreign languages, especially the ancient ones, is less than a phobia, encouraged, alas, by poor teaching of languages in many

schools, and by pastors who excuse their own ignorance or handicap by telling the candidates that 'languages are a waste of time.' 3. Too few have been trained in even elementary logic; they feel contradictions, or they draw inferences by *intuition*. 4. They are far more thoroughly schooled in criticism than in exposition. They can attack and tear down better than they can build up. 5. World literature, world history, and the general history of philosophy are almost unknown to the majority. Some of the simplest allusions to general history or literature are completely over their heads. 6. There is an appalling ignorance of classical poetry and art; the great tradition of religion in our race ought to carry with it its own expression in art and poetry, but, alas, this is not so. Poetry is even looked upon with scorn by many! This is a high price to pay for the 'college activities' and campus fame which some of them achieved before entering the seminary. 7. The single-track mind that knows only the Bible and theology — or only the Bible — is headed for fundamentalism; and there are students, even in liberal seminaries, who face that way. We have some of the best students in the world in the seminaries these days, but they deserve far better preparation than we can ever give them for lack of the foundation which their high-school and college courses should have provided. . . . No wonder if the student sees only two alternatives before him, the two already mentioned, skepticism and fundamentalism, or, possibly, two others, Liberalism and Catholicism, though the last two are rarely embraced by Protestants at the present time." The writer of this does not quite follow Dr. Grant's last remark, for, as a matter of fact, at the present time not a few Protestant ministers do embrace Liberalism, while others are attracted by Catholicism. But his analysis of the "current defects" should be heeded by all means; and what he says of the dangers of the "single-track mind" was long ago sensed by Luther, that great teacher of teachers, when he envisaged the training of pastors for their sacred office in its possibly widest scope. The minister of today dare not be narrow in his grasp of issues facing him in his important work; for him the fundamentalist outlook is as perilous as is the liberal. As St. Paul, about nineteen centuries ago, so also he must be made "all things to all men to save some," and this requires that he does not enter the ministry with a single-track mind. Evidently the present era is oriented to missions, and rightly so. But manifestly the Church will fail in its task if it is not also oriented to Christian education, in particular, to the adequate training of the men who are to do its mission work at home and abroad.

J. T. M.

Yale Launches Judaica Series (R. N. S.). — First English translation of the *Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, chief philosophical work of Saadia — the Aristotle of the Jews — has been published here by the Yale University Press.

Written in Arabic, the pioneer work of the Hebrew sage has been translated from the original by Samuel Rosenblatt, associate

confession than the EKID.' This agreement was made particularly to guarantee spiritual ministrations to the millions of displaced German Protestants who now reside on territory of established churches other than their own. While it would seem to provide for unrestricted participation in Holy Communion, its practical application was intended only in cases of 'dire extremity,' for example, if a church member was dying and was not able to receive the Lord's Supper from his own denomination. It was pointed out that refugees of the Reformed faith are often invited to the Lord's Supper of Lutherans, but Lutheran churchmen at the sessions were opposed to having the practice validated through a constitutional provision in EKID. Professor Paul Tillich of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, who is visiting in Germany this summer, observed that 'The Lutheran Church is developing a tendency to win power within Protestantism.' Dean Heinrich Grueber, a member of the Office of Church Affairs of the Berlin City Council, declared that 'the attitude of Lutherans indicates their confessional power.' Bishop F. Otto Dibelius of Berlin admitted that the matter of administering the Lord's Supper to Reformed refugees 'constitutes a serious problem for Lutherans.' "

The question arises whether a federation of this kind, where the denominational doctrinal differences are not removed, but recognized to exist, can live and prosper. Many a Lutheran will feel that the federation is a violation of the Scriptural principle that we Christians must be faithful to every truth that God has revealed in the Holy Scriptures. We are happy to see that the Lutheran consciousness was strong enough to prevent the establishment of a union church, in which all differences would simply be submerged and error would be granted the same rights as the truth. Another question of interest for us is whether the Eisenach decisions will ultimately interest and affect also the lower echelons, the congregations, or whether these resolutions are merely legislative enactments which become binding without the congregations' voice in the matter having been heard. May the day soon dawn upon Europe when the laity will be fully conscious of its glorious prerogatives and high responsibilities.

F. E. M.

Educating for the Ministry.—In *Christendom* (Pre-Amsterdam Number, Summer, 1948), Prof. F. C. Grant of Union Theological Seminary, under this heading, offers a number of valuable suggestions regarding the training of pastors for knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed in the modern ministry, which well deserve study by the Christian churches today. In closing his article he lists some of the current defects, the result, very largely, of inadequate high school and college education, as follows: "1. Too many students cannot spell accurately, punctuate, or use proper grammar. The same goes for vast numbers of the ordained ministers of our churches. 2. The attitude of too many of them toward the study of foreign languages, especially the ancient ones, is less than a phobia, encouraged, alas, by poor teaching of languages in many

schools, and by pastors who excuse their own ignorance or handicap by telling the candidates that 'languages are a waste of time.' 3. Too few have been trained in even elementary logic; they feel contradictions, or they draw inferences by intuition. 4. They are far more thoroughly schooled in criticism than in exposition. They can attack and tear down better than they can build up. 5. World literature, world history, and the general history of philosophy are almost unknown to the majority. Some of the simplest allusions to general history or literature are completely over their heads. 6. There is an appalling ignorance of classical poetry and art; the great tradition of religion in our race ought to carry with it its own expression in art and poetry, but, alas, this is not so. Poetry is even looked upon with scorn by many! This is a high price to pay for the 'college activities' and campus fame which some of them achieved before entering the seminary. 7. The single-track mind that knows only the Bible and theology — or only the Bible — is headed for fundamentalism; and there are students, even in liberal seminaries, who face that way. We have some of the best students in the world in the seminaries these days, but they deserve far better preparation than we can ever give them for lack of the foundation which their high-school and college courses should have provided. . . . No wonder if the student sees only two alternatives before him, the two already mentioned, skepticism and fundamentalism, or, possibly, two others, Liberalism and Catholicism, though the last two are rarely embraced by Protestants at the present time." The writer of this does not quite follow Dr. Grant's last remark, for, as a matter of fact, at the present time not a few Protestant ministers do embrace Liberalism, while others are attracted by Catholicism. But his analysis of the "current defects" should be heeded by all means; and what he says of the dangers of the "single-track mind" was long ago sensed by Luther, that great teacher of teachers, when he envisaged the training of pastors for their sacred office in its possibly widest scope. The minister of today dare not be narrow in his grasp of issues facing him in his important work; for him the fundamentalist outlook is as perilous as is the liberal. As St. Paul, about nineteen centuries ago, so also he must be made "all things to all men to save some," and this requires that he does not enter the ministry with a single-track mind. Evidently the present era is oriented to missions, and rightly so. But manifestly the Church will fail in its task if it is not also oriented to Christian education, in particular, to the adequate training of the men who are to do its mission work at home and abroad.

J. T. M.

Yale Launches Judaica Series (R. N. S.). — First English translation of the *Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, chief philosophical work of Saadia — the Aristotle of the Jews — has been published here by the Yale University Press.

Written in Arabic, the pioneer work of the Hebrew sage has been translated from the original by Samuel Rosenblatt, associate

professor of Oriental languages at Johns Hopkins University and rabbi of the Beth Tfiloh Congregation, Baltimore, Md. The book is the first volume in the newly launched Yale Judaica Series.

Saadia, rector of the Talmudic Academy of Sura in Babylonia, died in 942 A.D. He was the first Jewish thinker who attempted to give the religion of his people a scientific basis. His *Book of Beliefs and Opinions* ushered in the era of science and philosophy among Jews at a time when Islam was the ascendant civilization.

The Yale Judaica Series is being supervised by a board of editors composed of Prof. Julian J. Obermann of Yale, chairman; Prof. Louis Ginzberg of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America; and Prof. Harry A. Wolfson of Harvard.

According to Prof. Obermann, the Judaica Series will consist mainly of translations of ancient and medieval Jewish classics into English.

Proposal for a Seminary D.D. Degree.—Under this heading the *Presbyterian* (April 17, 1948) reprints with permission an article from *McCormick Speaking* (December, 1947) by Ovid R. Sellers, which discusses the question why ministers ask for a seminary D.D. degree and suggests how the demand may be met. Writing about the "causes for discontent," he says: "It would be a mistake to hold that there is no cause for dissatisfaction about academic recognition in the ministry. If all ministers were called 'Mister,' probably there would be less cause for discontent; but there are the favored ones who have the degree of D.D. and so are entitled to be addressed as 'Doctor.' All ministers know that this degree means nothing in terms of scholarly achievement, but in the public eye the preacher who is a Doctor rates more veneration than does the parson who is only a Mister. In any group of young ministers, next to the question of vacancy and supply, the subject which is sure to produce vehement discussion is the award of the D.D. Everyone can cite cases of men who barely finished seminary and who cannot write a paragraph of correct English and yet are entitled to wear three plush bars on their pulpit gowns. At the same time he knows of excellent scholars who are faithful and efficient in their ministry, but who have been overlooked by the colleges in the issuing of honorary degrees. While most of the men whom we expect to become Doctors do attain that distinction, we know that there are some equally deserving who do not. We think, too, that there are some who receive their doctorates through politics or sheer luck. Occasionally there is one who will purchase a degree from a diploma mill. Holding the degree of D.D., then, indicates some degree of proficiency in the ministry and the public recognition of such proficiency. Lack of a D.D. degree on the part of a man past forty is taken by the public to mean that he belongs to the mine run. Ministers know the unfairness in the situation. The foreign missionary who is capable and faithful but without influential home connections, or the home missionary,

no matter how well he does his work, is not considered a great success. Because he is content to work in obscure places and with undistinguished people, he is labeled unambitious." As a possible remedy the writer suggests a routine award of the D.D. degree by the seminaries, though not at the time of graduation, since some graduates go into secular work. The conferring of the D.D. upon worthy ministers, holding the B.D., should take place after they have spent ten years in the active pastorate, at least four of them in one location. There should be the additional requirement of approval by the presbytery or similar ecclesiastical authority. An exception, however, should be made with the foreign missionary. The requirement for him would be two six-year terms or four three-year terms on the field with assurance that he was continuing as a foreign missionary. Thus he would receive the degree during his furlough. If this plan is adopted, the worthy pastor or foreign missionary will have the assurance that in due time he will be a Doctor and there will be more parity in the ministry. The title will be deserved on the basis of service to the Church of Christ. To those engaged in true Christian service outside the pastorate or foreign mission, as for example, the teacher, the writer's suggestion is that they should earn their Ph.D. or Th.D. while teaching. Others, such as board secretaries, may receive an honorary degree by having their boards influence some college to grant them a D.D. While thus the seminaries grant the D.D. title, the colleges shall not be prevented from granting honorary titles whenever they desire to do so. The writer closes his remarks by saying that the question of giving a D.D. degree for professional competence is now under discussion by the Presbyterian Council on Theological Education, and that if the Presbyterian seminaries should adopt such a plan, other denominations will follow, so that within a few years the competent pastors with college and seminary training would have a title which would be deserved and understood. While in our own Church the demand for the D.D. degree is not yet as urgent as it seems to be in other denominations, it is nevertheless present to such an extent that Concordia Seminary is now offering to pastors the opportunity of acquiring the academic degree by continued study in the graduate department. Ours is the problem, too, that many deserving pastors or other consecrated ministers engaged in true Christian service outside the pastorate or foreign missions, do not receive the distinction which they deserve. Nor does it seem possible to exercise justice in every instance. Let those who are thus overlooked, bear in mind that the judgment of our laymen is still sound enough to recognize merit. It is not the title that makes the minister, but his divinely bestowed ability to use his office intelligently, courageously, and efficiently. Where this is the case, there, of course, the title should be granted. But even if this is not done, there will be recognition of personal merit without a title. After all, the matter is not as important as the writer in the *Presbyterian* seems to think it is.

J. T. M.

Attending Meetings.—*The Supplement*, published by the Rev. F. R. Webber of New York, contains, among other good things, also an article on the almost endless meetings to which our pastors are subject in their present-day wide and varied ministry. The many meetings of pastors constitute a problem which deserves careful consideration by both congregations and ministers. Not all can be avoided. The majority of them perhaps are necessary. But pastors by all means must be saved for their pastoral and missionary work, and, above all, for thorough preparation of their sermons and messages. Pastor Webber offers no solution of the problem, but the facts which he presents are worth considering. We read: "A periodical coming from our circles, and devoted to practical problems, tells of two pastors, one of whom attended 231 meetings during the year 1946, and the other 219 meetings. These, apparently, were listed among the legitimate duties of a pastor. The pastor who was present at 231 meetings devoted approximately 58 working days of eight hours each to the task, during 1946.

"At one time the writer had an associate who always seemed to have a meeting to attend. Today it might be a local conference, tomorrow a mixed conference, then a committee meeting in Philadelphia, and a seminar in Boston, or a round-table discussion in Albany. It is entirely safe to say that he devoted many more than 58 working days of eight hours each to attending meetings. He did not last very long." The writer then adduces the example of Alexander Maclaren, who rarely was seen at meetings, but who was at his desk eight hours a day, six days a week. He wrote not only his famous *Expositions of Holy Scriptures*, a series of 32 large volumes, but also many sermons and exegetical writings that would fill several shelves were all published. Nor was this confirmed "book worm" a failure in his parish. On the contrary, up to the end of his long and blessed ministry he preached to large congregations Sunday after Sunday who never tired to hear him, because he had solid food to offer them. Pastor Webber then continues: "It is quite safe to say that the pastor who attended 231 meetings in one year will never become the famous expository preacher that the world will remember. With men such as Alexander Maclaren and Campbell Morgan, the preparation of a sermon was a serious task, and a single sermon represented days of honest labor. Had they attended 231 meetings a year, the world would probably never have heard of them. This is not an endorsement of their theology, but rather is it an appreciation of their industry.

"Far too much time is wasted at meetings. The local and the district conference may be necessary, but many committee meetings might be eliminated, and with no loss to the progress of the Kingdom. Had St. Paul depended upon boards and committees, he would never have reached even Ephesus. A few meetings may be necessary, but more lasting results would be certain were the average pastor to follow the example of the old Scotsman

Alexander Maclaren rather than our own good brother who attended meetings to a total of 58 working days during 1946." Somewhere between the no-meeting-at-all man and the 231-meetings-a-year man is the golden mean for which the pastor should strive. Conditions vary, and the pastor must shape his workday accordingly. But let him never forget that he is in the King's service primarily to learn the Word and preach the Word. J. T. M.

The Capital and Labor Conflict. — The Christian Church is not to concern itself with politics and other purely secular issues. But it cannot avoid looking at questions that belong to the moral sphere. On account of our limited knowledge, decisions here are often extremely difficult. When the relations between capital and labor come into consideration, it cannot be denied that the Word of God has something to say on this head. The words of James 5:4 come to mind: "Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." On the other hand, instances where servants are admonished to be dutiful in their attitude toward their masters are well known. But who can say at what point capital is wrong when it refuses to increase the wages of the employees or to what extent labor must patiently submit to a yoke placed upon it by greedy, selfish capitalists? In any given instance the decision as to which party is right is fraught with mountainous difficulty. One thing the Church can do safely, and should do — preach the general principles laid down in the Scriptures. These thoughts came to us when we were reading an editorial in *America* (R. C. weekly) for May 15, 1948. We reprint the editorial here, not because we are sure that the statements are correct, but to help the readers of our journal in arriving at a just estimate of present-day conditions. Here we see at least how one important religious journal views the unrest in this particular field from which the whole country is suffering.

"Strike Wave. Big business made the bed. Now it wants labor to lie in it.

"That is what is behind most of the strikes, actual or threatened today. The workers are refusing to curl up submissively and take the consequences of one of the worst guesses industry ever made.

"The bed, it should be remembered, was made in the spring of 1946 by big business — spearheaded by the National Association of Manufacturers and strongly supported by greedy commercial farm interests — when it wrecked price controls. The story of the past two years has been, on the part of workers, a losing fight to catch up with galloping living costs; on the part of industry a reaping of the lushest crop of profits in history.

"Now, for some reason or other, big business has decided that prices have gone high enough. It is ready to admit publicly that its roseate predictions about what would happen to prices if only OPA shackles on production were removed, have not come true. Competition has not provided an abundance of goods at prices

people are able to pay, and there is no hope of anything like this happening in the near future. So business is going to defy the law of supply and demand which it lauded so fulsomely in 1946; it is going to stop the upward rush of prices by managing the economy. And since someone has to pay for the original blunder, why not the worker?

"But the workers do not want to pay for the blunder, at least not alone. They look at profits and wonder why industry cannot give them a modest wage increase to compensate for the advance in living costs since last year — and still not raise prices. And where they are strong enough, or desperate enough, they are resisting, or preparing to resist, lying in a bed that was made by others.

"That is the meaning of the packinghouse strike, and of the strikes of construction workers in Buffalo and aircraft workers at the Boeing plant in Seattle. And if they are not headed off, that will be the meaning of the strikes on railroads and in automobiles, at Westinghouse and General Electric.

"All these interruptions of production are deplorable and, in view of the present state of world affairs, ought to be avoided. But, barring a miracle, they will not be avoided. And the only miracle that can stop this insane march of events seems at the moment impossible.

"The miracle we have in mind is a meeting of the handful of men in big business and labor whose decisions have an impact on the whole economy. These men would assemble in Washington, with representatives of the Departments of Labor and Commerce, and there decide on a general policy covering wages and prices over the next twelve months. What that policy should be is clear: no wage increases and a healthy cut in prices — much more than the piddling reductions in steel prices announced last week. With this agreement in its pocket, the Government could then go to the farmers and demand a significant reduction in agricultural prices. With all parties concerned adhering to such a program, chances would be good not merely for avoiding industrial warfare, but for escaping some of the worst effects of our postwar folly. But, alas, it won't happen here.

"Meanwhile we regret the growing violence in labor disputes and ominous signs of intransigence and arrogance on the part of management. Are we headed back, one wonders, toward the dark days of 1937?"

A.

Road from Rome. — In *Theology Today* (April, 1948), Dr. G. A. Barrois, now teaching at Princeton Theological Seminary, narrates autobiographically the story of his pilgrimage from Romanism to Protestantism. Writing under the heading "Road from Rome," he says by way of introduction: "The publicity given to recent conversions to Roman Catholicism has aroused some interest on the part of readers hitherto indifferent to religious events, and some emotion among Protestants. The general impression has been

that of a one-way traffic to Rome. I have travelled in the opposite direction, and my case is far from unique. In spite of a natural shyness in coming under the spotlight, I feel impelled to tell my own version of the journey. I am not engaged in public affairs, nor does the position of my family in politics or business make me conspicuous in any way." The career of Dr. Barrois has been unique indeed. Born in the French Ardennes, in 1898, he was reared in the Catholic faith and in 1909 confirmed by Cardinal Lucon, Archbishop of Reims. Later he joined the Dominican Order, served with the French forces in Syria, completed his work for the doctor's degree in theology, and was ordained a priest. In 1925 he was sent to the French Biblical and Archaeological School in Jerusalem, took part in the exploration and excavation of several ancient sites, was more deeply led into Scripture by Father Lagrange, a leader of modern Catholic exegesis, and was called in 1934 to the Dominican Theological School in Belgium as professor of Old Testament Literature and Biblical Archaeology. During the Second World War he was invited to come to the Catholic University of America at Washington, D. C., as visiting professor in the Department of Egyptian and Semitic Languages and Literature. He arrived in Washington, D. C., in February, 1940. Here he came into contact with Protestant ministers, was received as a member of the Church of the Covenant, and a little later, of the Presbytery of Washington, obtained his doctor's degree from Princeton Theological Seminary, where he is now teaching. Dr. Barrois concludes his articles with the words: "I do not want to judge those who recently made their way to Rome. I am convinced of their sincerity. But I simply cannot accept the statement that they were converted from Protestantism to Catholicism. Their Protestantism was largely nominal. The memoirs of Mrs. Luce, previous to her profession of the Catholic faith, contain scarcely anything other than long disquisitions on psychoanalysis, and some sneering allusions to a religion of 'St. Einstein' — obviously one more witticism of the 'globaloney' type. That has nothing to do with Protestantism. Avery Dulles had formally repudiated every positive Christian belief, and even philosophical theism, before he decided to become a Catholic. It must therefore be concluded that, starting from nowhere, they have found Christianity in the Roman Church. Avery Dulles remarks that he was not attracted by the splendor of the ceremonies, or the riches of the liturgical symbolism. Truly, the scarlet robes of the Cardinals, in spite of the fact that they constitute desirable subjects for picture magazines, are not so impressive that they should determine the orientation for life of critical human beings. What is felt under that pageantry, however, is the invisible weight of a human institution which has ruled the western world for centuries, and thus appeals to men on the search for a principle of world-wide stability. I have experienced myself how powerful the prestige of the Papacy is, during a sojourn of several months in Rome, when I took the examination for a degree from the Pontifical Biblical Commission. The stability

which we seek must extend to the beyond. Our Roman pilgrims have made [it] a point to study the theology of their Church. I also am a theologian, and nearly thirty years of anguished reflection have taught me that Rome is not, on earth, the goal of our pilgrimage." J. T. M.

Introduction of the Vernacular in Some Roman Catholic Sacramental Rites. — A news item in *La Luce*, a Waldensian paper published in Rome, brings the information that Cardinal Suhard, the archbishop of Paris, requested the Sacred Congregation of Rites for permission in his diocese to use the French language when some of the sacraments are administered. Those that are mentioned are baptism, extreme unction, and marriage. Authority to introduce this innovation has already been granted in several other countries of Europe. *La Luce* states that the papal authorities have given a favorable reply to Cardinal Suhard. A liturgical commission is now at work in Paris preparing a bilingual ritual. Will the use of the vernacular help the cause of the Gospel? The question is difficult to answer. At any rate, the people receiving the rites, unless they happen to be infants, will have an opportunity of understanding what is being said. A.

Dr. Kittel Deceased. — Gerhard Kittel, the famous New Testament lexicographer, died in Tuebingen on July 11 after a lingering illness. Though a political prisoner, the French authorities, as well as Dr. Karl Arndt, endeavored to make the closing months of his life as pleasant as possible. Dr. Kittel was ready to resume the interrupted work on his New Testament Lexicon. According to his last will and testament, arrangements had been made to continue this highly technical and almost indispensable lexicon. At present the work has progressed to the letter *Omicron*. F. E. M.

Brief Items from Religious News Service

Concerning Protestants

Rev. Charles L. Grant, pastor of Faith Lutheran Church (U. L. C. A.), St. Paul, Minn., now sixty years old, has baptized 7,378 infants and 650 adults. He has married 4,007 couples. His congregation numbers 3,300 active members. He has conducted as many as eight marriage ceremonies in a single afternoon and has performed 32 baptisms in an afternoon. [Some of the ceremonies, we are sorry to say, were of the stunt variety. A.]

From Dallas, Tex., it is reported that Missions Unlimited, Incorporated, has been organized by a group of Southern Baptist laymen to raise funds for a gigantic one-hundred-year Foreign Mission program. "Six thousand missionaries now" is the slogan of the organization chartered under the laws of Texas. It would multiply by ten the present Southern Baptist mission force of 600. Organizers are Dallas businessmen. Ten of them form the board of directors. They seek six million members paying \$17 annually — "just the price of a pair of shoes," says the folder. A foundation is

to be set up so that the pledge of \$17 per member will be paid annually, even after the donor's death, until the hundred-year period is up.

A retired Baptist minister in North Carolina has charged that the demand of many churches for "titled" pastors sometimes forces ministers to buy honorary doctor's degrees. He was referring to recent news stories to the effect that five Carolina ministers recently bought the doctorate degree for fifty dollars.

The first Nisei (Japanese born in the United States) to serve as a missionary in Japan from a Protestant Church in the United States is twenty-seven-year-old Eunice Noda. She was commissioned by the Board of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Church in America. Her support will come from the First (Community) Church of Kew Gardens, of which she is a member. While she has never been in Japan, she was taught Japanese by her parents.

Plans for the tercentenary celebration of the adoption of the Cambridge Platform were announced at sessions of the General Council of the Congregational Christian churches meeting in Oberlin, Ohio. The observance will be held October 27 at Cambridge, Mass. The Cambridge Platform established a pattern for "free church" organization which has been developed not only in the Congregational churches, but also by Baptists, Disciples of Christ, Unitarians, and Universalists.

The General Assembly of the Church of the Nazarene, meeting in St. Louis, Mo., in June, launched a so-called Mid-Century Crusade for Souls. The denomination numbers 4,000 clergymen and 210,000 members. A budget of five million dollars will be asked of the church chiefly for the purpose of the crusade.

In Tulsa, Okla., a high school student, Fred Jones, sixteen years old, was ordained as a Baptist minister. "He already preached more than two hundred times in Kansas and Oklahoma churches."

A special assembly committee of the New Jersey Legislature conducts hearings on the question whether bingo should be legalized in the state. Protestant clergymen oppose legalization, while several Catholic groups and Veterans' organizations favor it.

A special committee has been set up by the parliamentary group of the conservative party to study Church-State relationship in Denmark. A professor of theology and two clergymen belong to the committee. It is expected that the committee will introduce a bill next autumn providing for greater independence of the Church from the State. The bill is expected to assure the church autonomy on all matters except financial ones, which latter would still be determined by Parliament and the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs.

In Hungary nine Protestant Bible scholars have completed a revision of the New Testament in their native tongue. The volume will be published before the end of the year.

In Great Britain Methodists discuss the question whether women should be ordained to the Holy Ministry. "Up till now the Church has merely declared that in principle there is no objection to the admission of women."

Forty-four per cent of German Protestants live in the Russian Zone of occupation. There are forty million Protestants in Germany, and of these 17,500,000 are in the Russian Zone. The American Zone is primarily Roman Catholic.

Since the winter semester of 1945-46 the number of Protestant students of theology at German universities has increased more than one hundred per cent, according to the *Evangelical Press Service*. For the winter semester of 1947-1948, 3,662 theological students were enrolled. Of this number 707 studied at theological faculties of the Eastern Zone and at the Berlin Church Academy, and 2,955 at faculties and church academies in the Western Zones.

The Evangelical Church in Germany (EKiD) has reported a total membership of 39,959,439 in the four occupation zones. Since 1939 there has been an increase of 990,430.

Concerning Roman Catholics

Two letters of the late Dr. William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, addressed to the Apostolic Delegate of the Roman See in England, have now been published. The first one, sent October, 1943, sympathetically referred to restrictions imposed on the Pope by the German occupation in Rome. The second, written on Good Friday, 1944, six months prior to Dr. Temple's death, asked the Apostolic Delegate to forward another message of sympathy. This letter included a prayer for early peace, that "the whole fellowship of Christ's disciples may be so guided by the Holy Spirit that we together declare the Christian principles for ordering of human life."

Appeals by parents of nearly fifty Albany District pupils, asking that transportation to parochial schools be provided by school districts, have been upheld in a special order issued by the New York State Department of Education.

In New York a heated discussion is going on on the question whether the board of superintendents of the public schools was justified in barring the *Nation*, a well-known weekly magazine, from the reading rooms under their control. The action was taken because allegedly beliefs of the Roman Catholic Church were attacked in two series of articles published in the *Nation*. In justification of the course taken the superintendent of schools said, among other things: "We have tried to inculcate in our pupils

a proper respect for the religious beliefs of their classmates. Our Constitution guarantees freedom of worship to all people. Surely a school teacher has no right to raise doubts in the minds of his pupils as to the validity of their religious beliefs. . . . Freedom of the press has never meant that everything that is printed must necessarily be used in the public schools."

Roman Catholic nuns who will teach in North Dakota next fall will wear ordinary dresses, probably made by themselves. "They will wear some kind of head covering, and some will wear no head covering at all if their hair grows out enough."

As a result of legislation nationalizing all church schools in Hungary, more than 4,500 Catholic priests, nuns, and lay teachers have become "unemployed." According to the church authorities they will not have to remain idle. All indications are that when the former Catholic schools re-open in September, they will have no Catholic teachers on their staffs."

A new periodical, *Regno di Dio* (Kingdom of God), which claims to be "an instrument for studying the problem of religious reform," has made its appearance in Italy. Its avowed objective is to bring about the "reform" of Roman Catholicism. The publication is sponsored by leaders of the so-called Movement of Religion, composed of individuals of different faiths, including former Roman Catholic priests and a group of active Catholic clergymen said to be "secretly organized" to reform Catholic dogmas and change the Church's hierarchical structure.

Other Items

In Dresden, Germany, lying in the Russian Zone of occupation, a book intended to be a textbook in the schools was published having the title "From Luther to Hitler." The author is Wolfram von Hanstein. He assails Luther as the first to preach German imperialism and as the "real destroyer" of European unity. He maintains "that the roots of Fascism can be discovered in Luther and subsequently traced to Frederick the Great, Emperor William, and thence to Hitler."

In Prague the Premier of Czecho-Slovakia, Antonin Zapotocky, declared that his country stands for freedom of religion, that every religious faith "has the right to teach its creed in this country and perform its religious rites, and every citizen has the right to practice them. Nobody prevents or will prevent him from doing so. These religious rites must not, however, be misused against the people's democratic republic. No appeals must be made to believers during these rites to abstain from carrying out their civic duties."

From New York comes the report that Dr. Frank C. Laubach, noted missionary, educator, and pioneer literacy expert, has returned here after a nine-months' tour of eleven African countries.

He told a press conference that more than 250 million illiterates throughout the world have learned to read by using the phonetic method which he advocates. The basic principle of his system is the association of pictures, words, and syllables. His method—similar in many respects to ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics and Chinese characters—uses charts and graphs which depict objects or ideas through pictures of familiar objects.

As a result of American occupation of Okinawa the number of Christians has increased substantially. Before the war the number of Protestants totaled 800, now there are 3,000 of them. "Most Okinawans have no religion at all except for a smattering of ancestor worship." The higher classes are acquainted with Christianity, Buddhism, and other religions, but they "are simply apathetic to any spiritual life," according to Yoshio Higa, an ordained Methodist minister.

It is possible that Chinese Communists will alter their policy toward foreign relief workers, missionaries, and Chinese Christians. This report comes from Kaifeng, which recently was occupied by Communists for a short period. During this time Red authorities took steps to safeguard hospital and mission centers and provided watchmen to prevent looting.

Plans for a world federation of Spiritualist churches and organizations are being made. Rev. J. Bertram Gerling of Rochester, N. Y., will go to London in September to confer with officers of the International Spiritualist Federation, which includes organizations in the British Isles, Europe, and South Africa.

For the first time in Finnish history a clergyman who ran for office on the Social Democratic ticket has been elected to the Diet, according to a report from Helsinki, Finland. About fifty per cent of the clergymen members of the old Diet failed of re-election.

An inspection of damage done in Jerusalem during the fighting between Jews and Arabs reveals that the Hurba Synagogue was entirely destroyed and that the Nissim Beck Synagogue was seriously damaged. The Rabbi Yohanan ben Sakkai Synagogue, representing Sephardic (Spanish and Portuguese) Jews lost all of its furnishings.

In August of this year 300,000 copies of the New Testament were distributed in the Russian Zone of Germany. This achievement was made possible through supplies of paper received from the American Bible Society.

In Berlin, Germany, clergymen of all communions unanimously declare that since the beginning of the Berlin crisis the number of churchgoers has more than doubled. Churches usually attended by a fixed number of regular worshippers are often crowded to capacity. Apart from the regular service, evening vespers held in parish houses by local pastors are now frequented.